



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

XIII.—THE CHRONOLOGY OF MILTON'S PRIVATE STUDIES

The remarkable autograph manuscript discovered in 1874 by A. J. Horwood among the papers of Sir Frederick Graham of Netherby is one of the basic documents for the study of Milton. It furnishes a list of some ninety authors, many of them by no means obvious, whom Milton knew; it indicates a large number of specific passages which he found interesting; and, finally, it contains, either explicitly or by implication, a host of opinions and ideas, consideration of which affords a new insight into the working of his mind. The Commonplace Book is, indeed, an important key to Milton's intellectual activity, and as such it merits a more careful critical consideration and a wider application than it has yet received. The facsimile published by the Royal Society of Literature¹ in 1876 rendered the document accessible in its original form, and Horwood's edition for the Camden Society² attempted a solution of some of the fundamental problems which must be dealt with before the note book can be put to fruitful use. But Horwood unfortunately did his work with little care and left it incomplete in many particulars. His text in the revised edition is reasonably accurate, but the editorial work is in the highest degree unsatisfactory. The editor did not undertake the necessary labor of identifying all the works and authors cited, nor did he always distinguish between those quoted by Milton at first and at second hand. His list of parallels from Milton's published

¹ *A Common-Place Book of John Milton*, reproduced from the original manuscript, London, 1876.

² *A Common-Place Book of John Milton*, edited by Alfred J. Horwood, London, 1876 (Camden Society); revised edition, 1877.

writings is scanty, and he has failed to supply other obvious apparatus.

The most serious barrier, however, to any extensive application of the Commonplace Book to the study of Milton has been the absence of certainty regarding the dates of the entries. They are not set down in chronological order, like the materials in the Cambridge Manuscript, and it is impossible from the printed text to form any idea when the separate entries were made. This is obviously a matter of the utmost importance if we wish to learn more from these entries than that Milton read such and such an author and was interested in such and such a passage or idea at some undetermined period of his life. Horwood points out a few indications of date in the case of individual entries, and occasional assertions have been made on the unsafe basis of the contents of the notes as to the periods to which they belong. It does not seem to have occurred to any student to make a more thorough application of the available evidence, especially that afforded by the manuscript itself, and to see how far it is possible to go toward a chronology of the entire body of material.

In studying the Commonplace Book recently with a view to taking a fuller account of the contribution made by it to our knowledge of Milton, the writer was led to experiment with the solution of this problem. The results, though by no means so complete as one could wish, are definite enough to justify a positive denial of certain current assumptions based on the inaccurate observations³ of Horwood, and to

³Horwood's statement that some of the writing (*i. e.*, the first and third entries on page 197) is in the hand of Daniel Skinner has been repeated without question by almost every writer who has had occasion to refer to the Commonplace Book. This identification is absolutely unsound, as anyone who cares to compare the scribal entries with Skinner's genuine handwriting can easily determine. (See p. 281, below).

suggest new conclusions of considerable importance. In the present paper I have undertaken, after discussing the criteria for dating the entries and describing the general method employed, to present a chronological analysis of the Commonplace Book and to indicate the bearing of the material, when so ordered, on the history of Milton's mind, reserving for later studies various miscellaneous questions which present themselves. Incidentally, I have added an expanded and corrected list of the authors and, wherever possible, of the editions referred to, in the hope that attention may be directed anew to many lines of investigation suggested by the document and that a more adequate working basis may be provided for its use.⁴

It is evident at a glance that the notes in the Commonplace Book were made at various times by a number of different persons. Distinction may at once be made between the entries in Milton's autograph and those in other hands. Of the latter, some (the minority) were evidently dictated by him. They follow the exact form established by Milton himself, and some of the handwriting is, as will be shown, identical with that of amanuenses whom he

⁴For the paleographical part of the investigation I have used in the first instance the autotype facsimile of the Commonplace Book. Observations based on this have, however, been tested with the original in the British Museum by Miss E. Margaret Thompson, who has also determined for me some doubtful points on the basis of differences in ink not adequately reproduced in the facsimile. Various other reproductions of the writing of Milton and his scribes and most of the originals available in America have also been employed. The edition of Milton's prose referred to is that of Mitford. It has proved impossible to trust the statements regarding Milton's autograph and the writing of his amanuenses made by earlier investigators in this field, though I have often benefited by their suggestions. I am greatly indebted to the keen observation and wide experience of Professor Carleton Brown, who very generously assisted me in the initial stages of my study.

is known to have employed. One set of entries was certainly not dictated by him. These are in a hand identified by Horwood as that of Sir Richard Graham, Lord Preston, who apparently acquired the volume after Milton's death. They are evidently the work of a person who, taking advantage of Milton's method and materials, continued the collection for his own purposes. This is proved by many small differences in the manner of entry, by the emergence of opinions and interests at variance with Milton's, and finally by the reference to an edition of Machiavelli published in 1675 (p. 177). Setting aside these entries, therefore, as not belonging to the document as Milton left it, we may divide the remaining material into notes inserted by Milton himself while he still had his eyesight and others dictated by him to the various amanuenses who assisted him in or before his blindness. The earliest date for the dictated entries cannot be determined on this ground with absolute certainty, for there is evidence that Milton made occasional use of scribes long before 1652, the year in which his blindness became complete. But the data afforded by the Cambridge MS. and other Miltonic documents is such as to establish a pretty strong presumption that any material in the hand of an amanuensis was written after about 1650.⁵

⁵ Phillips alludes to Milton's practice of dictating to his students passages from the Divines as a part of their Sunday exercises. In *Apology*, 1641/2, Milton speaks of reading good authors "or causing them to be read." The sonnet "Captain or Colonel or Knight at Arms," 1642, in the Cambridge Manuscript appears in a scribal hand, with revision of the title by Milton himself. Finally, the inscription in the album of Christopher Arnold, 1651, is in the hand of an amanuensis, with Milton's personal signature.

All this, however, does not show that Milton was in the habit of employing assistance for the writing of ordinary notes or for recording his compositions in prose or verse until the period of his partial or total blindness. Indeed, the Cambridge MS. appears to prove the

A second highly important step in the classification of the entries is made possible by a change which Milton adopted in his handwriting during his Italian journey (1638-9). In the majority of the autograph entries he uses the Italic form of the letter "e," in others the Greek form, and this he does, save in a few instances to be discussed later, with absolute consistency.⁶ The same phenomenon is to be observed in the Cambridge MS. and in all other specimens of Milton's handwriting. In the Cambridge MS. the text of the poems written during the Horton period (1632-8) employs the Greek "ε" with not more than a half-dozen exceptions; while the notes of dramatic subjects and the autograph sonnets (written after 1639) contain, except in the case of capitals and the superscript "e" in "ȳ," not a single instance of this formation of the letter.

contrary. All the later sonnets in that document before that to Cromwell, 1652, are in Milton's hand, the last being the Fairfax sonnet of 1648, though several of them were copied after 1652 for the press by scribes. Besides the Cambridge MS. materials the latest specimens of Milton's autograph, except signatures, are: a list of his treatises from 1641 to 1648 (Sotheby, *Ramblings*, 119); a letter to Dati, 1647 (New York Public Library); a receipt from Robert Warcup, 1647 (Dreer collection, Philadelphia); and entries in the Family Bible (*Milton Facsimiles*, published by the British Museum), made in 1646 and 1650. In the last mentioned document Milton has written also the first words of an entry of 1652, which is continued by an amanuensis.

⁶Horwood attempts to distinguish between the strata of Milton's autograph entries on the basis of general appearance, but his consequent division of them into "large and small writing" proves upon examination to be inaccurate. The size of the writing is dependent on circumstances. The early writing is usually smaller, but it is the formation of the letter "e" which constitutes the chief criterion, and of this Horwood makes no use. It is noted in Sotheby's *Ramblings in Elucidation of the Autograph of Milton*, and is applied by Masson to the Cambridge MS. The fact has not been used hitherto in relation to the Commonplace Book, nor have other specimens of Milton's writing been examined with reference to this point.

Sotheby issues a warning to those who would determine the date of an autograph from the formation of a single letter, but Milton's uncommon consistency in this, as in so many matters, leaves no doubt as to the general validity of the test. The first example of the later hand is the inscription in the autograph book of the Carduini family,⁷ dated June 10, 1639, where the Italic "e" is employed in the two quotations and the signature, and in all his subsequent writing Milton adheres uniformly to this practice. In the writing before 1638-9, he occasionally slips into the use of an Italic "e," but he does this so rarely that the uniform use of this character in any piece of writing consisting of more than a word or two constitutes a reasonably certain test of its having been written after his departure for Italy (April, 1638), while the use of a Greek "ε" even sporadically is practically conclusive evidence of a date prior to that time.⁸

⁷ In the possession of the Harvard College Library.

⁸ An apparent contradiction is to be found in the annotations made by Milton in the several volumes of classic authors which have come down to us from his Library—the Euripides, from which Sotheby gives a page of specimens, and the Pindar in the Harvard College Library. (The Lycophron, which I have had the privilege of examining through the courtesy of its owner, Mr. Alfred White of Brooklyn, uses consistently the Greek "ε.") In these sets of notes the "e's" seem to be freely mixed. The explanation is, in part, at least, that Milton returned from time to time to these volumes, the first notes in which were made before 1639. In the Pindar one extensive set of entries having the Italic "e" consists of quotations from a single author, Eustathius, and these are evidently later additions. The two page index at the end contains no single instance of Italic "e". The situation appears to be the same with the Euripides. It is certainly so in the corrections to the minor poems, which again might seem like an invalidation of the criterion. Thus in *Lycidas* the correction of "glimmering" to "opening," or "burnished" to "westring," and the note inserted after the title, "In this monodie" etc., all of which use consistently the later "e," were made after the publication of the first edition in 1638, presumably

We have, then, manuscript data for dividing Milton's reading notes into three chronological groups. It is possible to go further and to determine in many cases the order within the groups. Close inspection of the autotype shows that Milton invariably made the heading at the top of the page at the same time that he recorded the first entry under it, and that this first entry was in every case but one⁹ put at the top of the page contiguously with the heading. The remaining entries were made at the same writing or later. It is often possible to distinguish by the handwriting strata of notes clearly separated by intervals of time. On page 109, for example, the first and ninth blocks of entries (the first and twelfth in Horwood) are brought out to an even margin and bear every evidence of having been written under the same conditions. They are obviously earlier than the other entries on the page, which were filled in singly or in groups in the remaining spaces, some care being taken to have each additional note placed near the one to which it is most closely related in idea. These evidences of stratification in the entries extend, as we shall see, beyond the single page.

Taking this kind of evidence as a basis, and applying such other simple manuscript tests (crowding, etc.) as

just before the publication of the 1645 edition of the poems. This kind of explanation removes a large proportion of the apparent irregularities. There remain some cases of the Italic "e" in the text of the minor poems, a considerable number in the Pindar, and several in one correction to *Lycidas* which was certainly made before 1633. One post-1639 entry in the Commonplace Book, moreover, has two exceptional instances of Greek "ε." The letter is written rather large and is in each case separated from the initial letter of the word as if a capital (see last entry on p. 183).

⁹P. 249, where an amanuensis wrote the heading at the top of page and began the entry in the middle, the space between being later filled in by Lord Preston.

will at once suggest themselves, we may now inquire how far the analysis will carry us toward a complete and significant chronology of the entries, and whether the order of the notes affords a reliable index of the order in which the authors cited were read by Milton. The evidence here is rather complex and the detail must be reserved for presentation later. But it will be clear, I think, that the Commonplace Book exhibits a quite unexpected simplicity of method, and that it is possible to make it serve as a rough guide to one large department of Milton's reading. It is to be observed that Milton did not record in the volume notes from works to which he must constantly have been referring. There are only three quotations from the classics and none at all from Scripture. Nor did he ordinarily, as we shall see, use it for materials gathered in the immediate process of research, but rather as a permanent aid to his thought and memory. The great majority of the entries were obviously made in the course of Milton's general reading in certain fields. The method employed was apparently to mark the significant passages and from time to time to write up a series of notes based on them under appropriate headings in the Commonplace Book. Often he appears to have used several authors simultaneously, as, for example, in studying the history of England, and here we find a mingling of references to various works in the same note. Sometimes, too, a passage considered as worth recording recalled another in some work previously read. But the passage so recalled is apt to be from an author whom Milton had been through very recently, and this process is not carried far enough to invalidate the general assumption that the chronological position of one note relative to others indicates the position of the work to which it refers in the scheme of Milton's reading and the place of the entire body of notes

from that author in the chronology of the *Commonplace Book*. The surprising thing is that the evidence is so seldom contradictory in this regard. There are, moreover, various ways of checking the results, as indicated in particular cases below.

For the actual dating of the notes and the reading in the first two periods there is material in the dates of publication of the works or editions used by Milton,¹⁰ and in allusions in Milton's other works. The latter are especially conclusive when they are to passages cited in the *Commonplace Book*. An exhaustive application of data of this sort is obviously impossible until the question of Milton's use of materials from the authors cited has been fully worked out. The present study must therefore be regarded as to this extent incomplete.

For the third period of Milton's life (c. 1650-1674), that which followed his partial or total loss of sight, we have the data for grouping the various sets of entries in the handwriting of the different scribes to whom they were dictated. The whole question of Milton's use of amanuenses is here involved, and unfortunately the facts are far from clear. It seems quite certain, however, that the old idea of their being members of his family is untenable. The evidence of the extant documents, against the statements of the biographers, is remarkably consistent for a series of scribes working for him in successive periods. This is borne out by the Cambridge MS. and

¹⁰ The edition can usually be ascertained only when Milton gives page references. In many cases he cites book and chapter. With the assistance of Miss E. Margaret Thompson, working in the British Museum, I have succeeded in identifying, in all but a few instances, editions to which Milton's page references apply. Where the pagination of several duplicate issues answers to Milton's pages I have so stated. All editions available to Milton, of which copies are to be found in the British Museum or in the Harvard College Library have been examined.

other scribal material so far as we can date it, and by the Commonplace Book itself. Owing to the scanty number of the dictated entries there is little indication in the manuscript of the relative position of the groups. But several of the hands can be identified as belonging to scribes whose work appears in other Milton items of known date, and the conclusions as to chronology suggested by these identifications can sometimes be checked by other data.

The analysis, with the detailed observations on which it is based, follows. In order to simplify the presentation, it has been necessary to relegate all modifications of the general classification of the entries by authors, together with the citation of Milton's editions, to foot-notes. In cases, however, where entries from one work appear in more than one of the larger chronological divisions, the title is repeated. The order within the smaller groups is not especially significant, but I have endeavored to suggest by the arrangement the relation which different works bore to each other in Milton's program of study, from the standpoint of subject matter, sometimes, also, to indicate roughly the probable chronological relation of the notes. The grouping itself is meant to be uninfluenced by conjecture, though I have often been guided in my observations by the inherent probabilities of the case. The numbers in parentheses refer to the pages of the Commonplace Book.

AUTHORS ENTERED BEFORE 1639 (ALL IN MILTON'S HAND)

FIRST GROUP

These entries are in a small, neatly printed hand; they were evidently made with great care and attention to uniformity. It is possible to distinguish them at a

glance from all other writing in the volume. With the exceptions noted below the "e" is formed in the Greek fashion. The nearest approach to this style in other autograph material is the index to the Pindar (presumably written in 1634), but the writing bears a general resemblance to the script used throughout the early poems in the Cambridge MS., the latter being, however, hastier and more current. References from Socrates and Eusebius are frequently combined in the same note. There is no way of determining the order in which the authors included in this group were used. The notes may well have been made in large part at a single sitting. Wherever there is opportunity of testing them in relation to others, the position of the group as the earliest in the volume is confirmed.

The earliest allusions in Milton's published works to authorities in this group are in *Of Reformation* (1641), where, as also throughout the later prose, the church historians, Eusebius and Socrates, are heavily drawn on, sometimes with reference to the specific passages cited in the Commonplace Book.^{10a} Procopius is first referred to in *Doctrine and Discipline* (1643).

1. Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* (53,¹¹ 105, 109, 177).
2. Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* (55, 181).
3. Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia Ecclesiastica* (53, 55, 61, 109, 151, 181).
4. *Historia Miscella*¹² (181).

^{10a} See W. T. Hale's edition of the tract *Of Reformation*, *Yale Studies in English*, Introduction, for a discussion and list of Milton's borrowings.

¹¹ This entry, a mere citation added to the note from Socrates (No. 3), is in a different style and has two instances of Italic "e." The incident referred to is elaborated in *Areopagitica*, P. W., II, 409.

¹² This is an anonymous compilation in 24 books, based in the

5. Procopius, *De Bello Persico*¹⁸ (151, 230).

SECOND GROUP (later than Group I)

The writing here is much less uniform than that of the Group I entries, and at least three strata are discernible: (a) the notes from historical authors (including Sigonius, Gregoras, Cantacuzenus, and Nicephoras), written rather carefully after the general manner of the Group I entries but easily distinguishable from them; (b) the notes from Dante, Boccaccio, and Prudentius, similar to (a) in general appearance but in a lighter ink; (c) most of the references to the fathers, hastily written with a coarse pen and black ink. The three styles, together with that of Group I, are very clearly illustrated on pages 181-2. The Dante-Boccaccio-Prudentius group (b) is determined by page 182 to be later than the Sigonius group (a). The manuscript seems to provide no certain criterion for deciding the chronological position of the entries from the fathers (c).

Suggestions as to the date of the studies here represented are afforded by Milton's use of an edition of Severus published in 1635, and by the statement in a letter to Diodati, dated September, 1637, that he had finished a course of reading in later Greek history and in the period of Italian history covered by Sigonius (see below, p. 291). He speaks in Epistle VIII (Florence, September 10, 1638) of his delight in feasting on Dante. It has been argued, though inconclusively, that the influence of the Divine

Historia Romana of Paulus Diaconus. Milton's page references fit "*Historiae Miscellae a Paulo Aquilegiensi Diacono Lib. XXIV, editi ab Henrico Canisio Noviosnago I. C.*" . . . Ingolstadii . . . 1603.

¹⁸ The Persian War constitutes the first two books of Procopius' *Historiae*. Milton's references are to the editio princeps, edited by Hoeschel, Augsburg, 1607.

Comedy is to be found in "Lycidas" (1637). See Oscar Kuhns, "Dante's Influence on Milton," *Modern Language Notes*, XIII, 1-11. Milton shows thorough familiarity with the works referred to of Cyprian, Ignatius, Tertullian, Justin, Severus, Cedrenus, and Sigonius in the tract *Of Reformation* (1641), occasionally citing one of the passages referred to in the Commonplace Book.¹⁴

6. Sulpicius Severus, *Historia Sacra*¹⁵ (150,¹⁶ 182¹⁶).
7. Evagrius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* (220).
8. Sigonius, *De Occidentali Imperio* (182¹⁷).
9. Sigonius, *De Regno Italiae*¹⁸ (183, 220, 240).
10. Gregoras Nicephoras, *Historia Byzantina*¹⁹ (181, 220, 240).
11. Cantacuzenus (John VI), *Historia Byzantina*²⁰ (240).
12. Dante, *Divina Comedia*:²¹ *Inferno* (12, 16, 70, 160); *Paradiso* (111).
13. Dante, *Canzone IV*²² (191).

¹⁴ See Hale, *loc. cit.*

¹⁵ Milton's references fit the Elzevir edition, Leyden, 1635.

¹⁶ These notes have several instances of Italic "e."

¹⁷ This note begins a second page under the title "Rex," the first having been already nearly filled with entries from the Group I authors.

¹⁸ Milton's references fit the edition published by Wechel at Frankfurt in 1575 and the duplicate edition published by the heirs of Wechel at Frankfurt in 1591, fol.

¹⁹ The early editions of Gregoras contain only the first eleven books, covering the period from 1204 to the accession of John VI in 1341. The remaining thirteen were added in the Paris folio of 1702.

²⁰ Milton must have used the Latin translation of Cantacuzenus by Jacobus Pontanus, 1603. The Greek text remained inedited until 1645.

²¹ The edition is fixed by the reference on page 160, which cites Canto XI and "Daniell. in eum locum," i. e. "*Dante*, con l'espositione di M. Bernardino Daniello da Lucca sopra la sua *Comedia*," Venezia, 1568. This is the only edition of Daniello's commentary.

²² This is the *Canzone* on Nobility, prefixed to the fourth book of the *Convivio*.

14. Prudentius, *Liber Peristephanon* (191²⁴).
15. Boccaccio, *Vita di Dante*²⁴ (182²⁵).
16. Ariosto, *Orlando Furioso* (151²⁶).
17. Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*²⁷ (71, 109).
18. Clement of Alexandria, *Paedagogus* (106).
19. Cyprian, *Tractatus de Disciplina et Habitu Virginum* (106).
20. Cyprian, *Epistolae* (109).
21. Cyprian, *De Spectaculis* (241).
22. Ignatius, *Epistolae*²⁸ (109).
23. Tertullian, *De Spectaculis* (4,²⁹ 241²⁹).

²³ Obviously entered contemporaneously with note from Dante (No. 13).

²⁴ Unless Milton is citing Boccaccio at second hand from some unmentioned source he must have used the editio princeps, published by Sermartelli, Florence, 1576. He remarks that the incident of the burning of the *De Monarchia* was suppressed in later editions of the *Vita*, which he may therefore also have known. If this is a second hand quotation it is the only one made in the Commonplace Book without reference to its immediate source.

²⁵ This entry was clearly set down at a later time than the note from Sigonius (No. 8).

²⁶ Italic "e" used four times in this entry. The note was apparently made with a different pen from the Dante group (Nos. 12-14).

²⁷ Milton's references to Clement all fit the edition of the *Opera* published by Carolus Morellus, Paris, 1629, reissued in duplicate by Mathaeus Guillemot, Paris, 1641. These editions contain annotations by Fredericus Sylburgius and material from other commentaries.

²⁸ Milton's references fit the Geneva edition of Ignatius, published in 1623, "cum XII exercitationibus in eundem Ignatium pro antiquitate Catholica adversus Baronium et Bellarminum auctore Nicolao Videlio, professore in Academia Genevensi et verbi divini ministro."

²⁹ These two entries and the following from the *De Jejuniis* constitute the most considerable portion of the notebook in which Milton mixes the Greek and Italic "e." There can be little doubt that the entries belong before 1639 and constitute a chronological unit with the other materials from the fathers. Milton cites the edition of Rigaltius. This would be the first Rigaltius edition, published at Paris, c. 1634, presumably identical in pagination with the second,

24. Tertullian, *De Jejuniis* (13).
25. Tertullian, *Apologetica* (181).
26. Justin Martyr,^{29a} *Tryphon* (109³⁰).
27. Justin Martyr, *Apologia pro Christianis* (182³¹).
28. Cedrenus, *Compendium Historiarum*^{31a} (109³²).
29. Sozomen, *Historia Ecclesiastica* (109³³).

AUTHORS ENTERED BETWEEN 1639 AND 1652 (ALL IN
MILTON'S HAND)

FIRST GROUP

The entries here and in the later groups in this division have uniformly the Italic "e." Lactantius (No. 30) is twice associated with Tertullian (No. 23), but close inspection of the writing will show that in both cases the Lactantius entry belongs to a later stratum (pages 4, 241). On page 14 Milton has combined a Lactantius citation with a reference to the sodomy of King Mempricius "in fabulis nostris," but the latter note is a recollection of Geoffrey of Monmouth (II, 6), read in the Horton period, and is not from the chronicle history reading represented in Group II. Elsewhere the Lactantius entries are en-

Paris, 1641, which answers to Milton's page references. No copy of this first edition is accessible to me.

^{29a} Milton used the Cologne ed. of the *Opera*, 1636.

³⁰ This note must have been made with the Ignatius-Clement-Cyprian group above it (Nos. 17-22).

³¹ This note is apparently contemporaneous with the entries from Sigonius, *De Imperio* (No. 8) and from Boccaccio (No. 15). The writing does not show the characteristics of the other entries from the fathers and cannot therefore be used as a test of the chronological position of the group.

^{31a} Milton apparently used the Basle ed. of 1566.

³² This entry, a mere citation, appears to have been added to the Eusebius note (No. 1) when the entries which follow were made from the Ignatius-Clement-Justin group (Nos. 17, 22, 26).

³³ This entry has the Italic "e" and may belong after 1639. It

tirely separate from the others, and the notes from Malmesbury and Holinshed on pages 14 and 173 are obviously of later date than those from Lactantius on the same page. Similarly the Savonarola entry (No. 33) on page 179 is evidently earlier than the items from the chronicles which follow it.

Lactantius is first explicitly cited in *Of Reformation* (1641), but there is reason to suppose that Milton may have been familiar with the *Institutes* at a much earlier period.³⁴

30. Lactantius, *De Ira Dei* (4).
31. Lactantius, *De Opificio Dei* (18).
32. Lactantius, *Divinae Institutiones* (4, 5, 14, 178, 241).
33. Savonarola, *Tratto delle Revelatione della Reformatione della Chiesa*³⁵ (179).

has, however, all the appearance of having been set down with those from the fathers on this page.

³⁴See Osgood, *American Journal of Philology*, Jan.-March, 1920; also A. F. Leach, "Milton as Schoolboy and Schoolmaster," *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 1907-8, pp. 305 and 307. Professor Osgood's parallels between the *Institutes* and the "Nativity Ode" seem to me conclusive of direct indebtedness. Cf. also Cook's citations from *Institutes*, II, 16, in connection with the stanzas about the cessation of oracles, *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy*, xv. In Mr. Leach's extract from Colet, where Lactantius is prescribed among other Christian authors for study in St. Paul's school, the poem on the Phoenix and not, as the writer assumed, the prose may be meant. However, Lactantius, as the "Christian Cicero" was much esteemed and his genuine writings may well have been studied by the advanced students at St. Paul's. Of Milton's general familiarity with Lactantius and of his large indebtedness to him there can be no doubt. (See below, p. 296.

³⁵The Latin editions are entitled *Compendium Revelationum* etc. Milton cites the Italian text, giving a page number. The edition printed at Florence in 1495 is without pagination. He must therefore have used some later reprint.

SECOND GROUP (later than Group I)

The references in this section show many varieties of Milton's handwriting and were evidently made at various times. The entries from Speed, Holinshed, Malmesbury, and Stow (Nos. 35-38) are so linked together that it is apparent that Milton was using these authors in close conjunction with one another when they were set down. A few Holinshed and Speed entries appear in later strata; so also do the notes from Sarpi (No. 49), Camden (No. 44), and the earlier books of Girard and Thuanus (Nos. 50-51). A chronological distinction might here be made, but it would be difficult to define it exactly on the grounds which I have adopted for this analysis. I have indicated some of the detail in the notes. A few detached entries are added when they seem quite certainly to be earlier than or contemporary with entries from other authors in this group. But for clearness in presentation of the sequence other more doubtful miscellaneous entries, also those which can be related to this group only on evidence other than paleographical, even when their chronology is quite certain, are reserved for individual treatment later.

From Milton's familiarity with English history displayed in *Of Reformation* (1641), where Camden, Holinshed, Speed, Hayward, and Sir Thomas Smith are directly or indirectly quoted,³⁶ we may infer the study represented by the titles in this group to have been well advanced by the summer of 1641. The same conclusion is suggested by the fact that Malmesbury, Holinshed, Stow, and Speed are associated also in the notes for British tragedies in the

³⁶ Hale, *loc. cit.* Hale notes that while Speed and Holinshed are nowhere cited their phraseology is reproduced in several places Bede is first cited in *Of Prelatical Episcopacy* (1641).

Cambridge MS., which are ascribed by Masson on various grounds to the twelve months (1639-40) immediately following Milton's return from Italy and which presumably grew out of the same study. What proportion of the notes in the Commonplace Book stood complete in 1641 is more doubtful, certainly the majority of those in the Holinshed-Speed-Stow-Malmesbury group. A note from Sir Thomas Smith (No. 39) is clearly echoed in *Of Reformation*³⁷ (1641) and the Camden entry on page 245 (No. 44) cites passages of which Milton makes use in the same pamphlet (Hale, *loc. cit.*). The Sleidanus note on page 76 (No. 46) is worked up in *Apology* (1641/2) (P. W., III, 260). Since most of the notes from this author were clearly written with the same pen we may feel assured that Milton had gone carefully through the work before writing his tract. The Camden notes as a whole are later than those from Holinshed etc., while those from Sarpi (No. 49), which seem from the writing to have been set down at one time, are later still. Fortunately we can date the Sarpi entries with considerable definiteness. The passage on divorce (p. 112) and the one on dispensations from the law (189) are made use of in the second edition of *Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*, published before February 2, 1643/4, but not in the first, published before August 1, 1643. Milton would almost certainly have embodied them in his first pamphlet had he noted them before he wrote it, for he was eager for support of his theory. Furthermore, the note on freedom of the press (p. 184) is employed in *Areopagitica*, November, 1644. Milton knew something of Sarpi, to be sure, as early as 1641, for he refers to him in *Reason of Church Government*, though in a manner which leaves it doubtful if he

³⁷ Prose Works, I, 56. Cf. second note from Smith on page 182.

had read him,³⁸ and it is possible that the Sarpi entries actually belong to the years 1640-1. At any rate, a *terminus ad quem* in 1643 is conclusively established for the elaborate body of notes in Group II, since in no case can one of them be shown to be later than an entry from Sarpi. It is to be observed that the divorce entries first appear in the Sarpi group, except for one not very explicit citation to Camden (p. 197), which may, of course, be later than the bulk of the chronicle notes.

34. Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica* ³⁹ (57).

35. William of Malmesbury, *De Gestis Regum Anglicorum* ⁴⁰ (14, 53, 72,⁴¹ 73,^{41a} 184, 185).

36. Stow, *Annales, or a General Chronicle of England* ⁴² (15, 57,⁴³ 72, 109, 179,⁴⁴ 180, 181, 184, 185, 220, 242).

37. Holinshed, *Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland* ⁴⁵ (17, 19, 72, 74, 109, 110, 178, 179, 181, 182, 183, 185,⁴⁶ 186,⁴⁷ 220, 221, 242, 243, 244).

³⁸ "You know, Sir, what was the judgment of Padre Paulo, the great Venetian antagonist of the Pope, for it is extant in the hands of many men." P. W. I, 41. Sarpi's prophecy of the civil war in England, to which he refers, would, of course, be a matter of common knowledge.

³⁹ For an edition of Bede presumably used by Milton see Gildas (No. 83).

⁴⁰ Milton's references agree with the edition of *De Gestis* in Saville's *Rerum Anglicarum post Bedam Scriptores*, London, 1596, and with a second folio of the same, Frankfurt, 1601.

⁴¹ Contemporaneous with entries from Holinshed (No. 37), Stow (No. 36), and Speed (No. 38). Elsewhere Malmesbury is regularly cited with the parallel passage in Stow.

^{41a} Malmesbury is not mentioned in this note but the anecdote is referred to him in Milton's *History of Britain*, P. W. III, 224.

⁴² Milton used the London folio of 1615 or the same as reissued in duplicate with additions in 1631.

⁴³ This entry is probably later than that from Bede (No. 34).

⁴⁴ Later than note from Savonarola and apparently contemporaneous with one from Holinshed (No. 37).

⁴⁵ Milton's references fit the three volume London folio of 1587.

38. Speed, *History of Great Britain* ⁴⁸ (53, 72, 74, 109, 160, 179, 180, 183, 185, 186, 187, 220, 221, 242, 245).

39. Sir Thomas Smith, *Commonwealth of England* (182,⁴⁹ 185).

40. Aristotle, *Ethics* (182⁵⁰).

41. Lambard, *Archeion, or a Commentary upon the High Courts of Justice in England* ⁵¹ (179, 183⁵²).

42. DuChesne, *Histoire Generale d'Angleterre, d'Escosse, et d'Irlande* ⁵³ (109,⁵⁴ 220⁵⁵).

43. Machiavelli, *Arte della Guerra* ⁵⁶ (177,⁵⁷ 182).

44. Camden, *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Regnante Elizabetha* ⁵⁸ (6, 109,⁵⁹ 177, 181,⁶⁰ 186,⁶¹ 188, 220,⁶² 242, 245).

⁴⁶ Crowded before and therefore later than the entry from Sir Thomas Smith (No. 39).

⁴⁷ Contemporaneous with entry from Girard (No. 50) and with Holinshed note on page 242.

⁴⁸ Milton's references fit the second edition, London, 1623, fol.

⁴⁹ The first and second entries from Smith seem to have been made with the Holinshed notes. The third is apparently earlier than the entry from Machiavelli (No. 43) at the foot of the page.

⁵⁰ A marginal jotting contemporaneous with third entry from Smith (No. 39).

⁵¹ Horwood erroneously takes Milton's reference to be to the *Archeionomia*, a collection of early English laws.

⁵² Simultaneous with Holinshed note (eleventh entry on this page).

⁵³ Milton's references answer to the pages of the second edition, Paris, 1634, fol., also to those of the third, Paris, 1641.

⁵⁴ Earlier than Camden (No. 44).

⁵⁵ Added to note from Holinshed (No. 37) at a later writing.

⁵⁶ Milton's references are to the edition of the *Arte* printed in *Tutte le opere di Nicolo Machiavelli* . . . 1550.

⁵⁷ Earlier than entry from Thuanus, Book 29, crowded before it (See No. 51).

⁵⁸ Milton's references fit William Stansby's edition, London, 1615.

⁵⁹ Later than note from DuChesne (No. 42).

⁶⁰ Written after the Holinshed entry to which it is attached, being in a paler ink.

⁶¹ Apparently later than Holinshed entry.

⁶² The Camden entries were apparently added on this page after it had been nearly filled with long citations from Holinshed (No. 37).

45. Hayward, *The Life and Reign of King Edward the Sixth* ⁶³ (245 ⁶⁴).

46. Sleidanus, *De Statu Religionis et Reipublica Carolo Quinto Caesare* ⁶⁵ ⁶⁶ (18, ⁶⁷ 55, 76, 181, ⁶⁸ 185, 243, ⁶⁹ 244, ⁷⁰ 246).

47. Ascam, *Toxophilus* (245 ⁷¹).

48. Jovius (Paolo Giovio), *Historia sui Temporis* ⁷² (13, ⁷³ 181, ⁷⁴ 242, ⁷⁵ 247).

49. Sarpi (Paolo Servita), *Istoria del Concilio Tridentino* ⁷⁶ (109, 112, 179, ⁷⁷ 184, ⁷⁸ 189, 244 ⁷⁹).

50. Girard (Book 1 only. See below, No. 53).

51. Thuanus (Earlier books only. See below, No. 52).

⁶³ Milton used the first edition, London, 1630.

⁶⁴ Apparently entered with the Speed-Ascam-Camden entries on this page.

⁶⁵ Milton's page references agree with none of the Latin editions in the British Museum or in Harvard College Library, nor with the English translation of 1560.

⁶⁶ Most of the entries from Sleidanus appear in a faded ink and were evidently written in at one time.

⁶⁷ Later than Lactantius (No. 31).

⁶⁸ At a different time from and probably later than the two Cuspinian entries (No. 61). Note ink and spacing.

⁶⁹ Later than Holinshed (No. 37).

⁷⁰ Earlier than the Thuanus-Sarpi group (Nos. 49-51).

⁷¹ Contemporaneous with citations from Speed and Camden (Nos. 38, 44).

⁷² Milton's references agree with the pagination of none of the editions available in the Harvard College Library or the British Museum.

⁷³ Added to Holinshed entries, being in a paler ink.

⁷⁴ Later than Holinshed entry.

⁷⁵ Milton's extracts are from the Italian edition, "*Istoria . . . di Pietro Soave*," London, 1619. Hales, in his edition of *Arcopagitica*, Oxford Press, p. 82, cites Nathaniel Brent's English translation, London, 1620, which Milton may, of course, also have known.

⁷⁶ Later than Holinshed entry, being crowded before it.

⁷⁷ Later than Malmesbury-Stow entry at top of page (Nos. 35-36).

⁷⁸ Later than Holinshed (No. 37) and Sleidanus (No. 46) and contemporaneous with entry from Thuanus, Book 21 (No. 51). The second Sarpi entry on this page is earlier than the note from Thuanus, Book 57.

THIRD GROUP (later than Group II)

The extensive set of entries from Comines, Girard, and Thuanus bears obvious marks of having been written, in the main, at one time. The writing is made with a particularly fine pen and is immediately distinguishable on the pages where it occurs. Moreover, the entries from these authors usually appear in close conjunction. To this set may be attached with reasonable assurance the isolated entry from Gilles (No. 55) on page 53. There is abundant evidence for dating the notes in this hand later than those in Group II. A study of the consecutive pages 109-116 with regard to the content of the entries will alone suffice to establish the sequence of these groups. Milton began page 109, "Matrimonium," and page 111, "De Liberis Educandis," before 1639. He next (*i. e.*, after the Italian journey) inscribed the title "Concubinatus," with an entry from Holinshed on the page which had been left blank between. He then entered the title, "De Servis," with three notes from Justinian on page 113. Later he began to fill the blank page 112 (now the nearest to "Matrimonium") with three entries from Sarpi under the new heading, "De Divortio." Still later, apparently, he added on page 112 the two entries from Leunclavius and the reference to Bodin, and, at one sitting, the notes from the Group III authorities, continuing them on page 114, which had been begun with the citation from Raleigh and those from the earlier books of Thuanus after page 109 was well filled with entries from Group II.

These remarks apply to all the Comines entries and to those from Books 3-6 of Girard and Books 71-2 of Thuanus. The entries from Girard, Book 1, and most of those from the earlier books of Thuanus are associated with the authors in Group II and are evidently earlier

(see notes). The divorce entries all occur in the later set of notes.

A definite dating of Group III is made possible by the publication of Gilles' *History of the Waldensians* in 1644 and by the fact that the divorce materials from Thuanus are first used in *The Judgment of Martin Bucer* (1644). Had Milton noted them before that year, he would almost certainly have embodied them in the second edition of *Doctrine and Discipline* (1643/4). This confirms the conclusion suggested by the facts about the Sarpi entries that the Group II notes stood complete by 1643. Girard is first cited in *Tenure of Kings* (1648/9) where materials from Thuanus are also used, Gilles in *Of Civil Power* (1659). "Girard and the French histories" are referred to in *Defensio* (1650).

52. Thuanus (Jacques Auguste de Thou), *Historia sui Temporis*⁷⁹ (14, 17,⁸⁰ 53, 110, 112, 114,⁸¹ 115,⁸² 177,⁸³ 182,⁸⁴ 183,^{84a} 184,⁸⁵ 185,⁸⁶ 186,⁸⁷ 188,⁸⁸ 244⁸⁹).

⁷⁹ Milton used the Geneva edition, 5 vols. fol., 1620.

⁸⁰ Book 12. Apparently simultaneous with Holinshed note (No. 37).

⁸¹ Entry 2 and the first line of entry 4 are from Book 35 and apparently belong with the Raleigh note at the top of the page (No. 67). The other Thuanus citations on this page, from Book 71, obviously belong to the later group.

⁸² Book 35. Not in later Thuanus hand.

⁸³ Book 29. With or later than the Camden note (No. 44).

⁸⁴ Book 63. Crowded between entry from Holinshed (No. 37) and Sir Thomas Smith (No. 39).

^{84a} The note regarding Charles Martel's parliament is given without reference but it is evidently from Thuanus cited in the next note on this page.

⁸⁵ Book 36. Not in later Thuanus hand. Probably contemporaneous with the Malmesbury entry at top of page (No. 35).

⁸⁶ The first entry is from Book 57. It is apparently earlier than the notes from Comines and Book 71 of Thuanus above and below it (Nos. 52, 54).

53. Girard (Bernard, Sieur du Haillan), *L'Histoire de France*⁸⁰ (53, 61, 109,⁸¹ 110, 112, 182, 183, 185, 186, 191).

54. Comines, *Memoires*⁸² (53, 67, 110, 185, 220).

55. Gilles, *Histoire des Eglises Vaudoises*⁸³ (53).

FOURTH GROUP (later than Group III)

The note from Sinibaldus begins a new page, "Divortium," page 112, having been already filled with entries from Groups II and III. The note from Cyprian is crowded before an entry from Girard, Book 4 (No. 53).

56. Cyprian, *De Singularitate Clericorum* (110).

57. Sinibaldus (Joannes Benedictus), *Geneanthropeia*⁸⁴ (116).

⁸⁰ Book 57. Not in later Thuanus hand. Later than Holinshed and Girard, Book I, which are written with the same heavy pen.

⁸¹ The last part of this note (from Book 52) was apparently made with the same pen as the entry from Book 57 on page 186.

⁸² Books 21 and 57. Simultaneous with first Sarpi entry (No. 39) but later than note from Sleidanus (No. 46).

⁸³ Milton's citations fit the Paris folio of 1576.

⁸⁴ The second Girard entry on page 109 and the first on page 186, both from Book I, were apparently set down with the Holinshed note at the top of page 106 at an earlier period than the group of Girard entries in the characteristic hand of Group III at the bottom of page 186, in the eighth entry on page 109 and elsewhere, all of which are from Books 3-6.

⁸⁵ The Galiot edition of 1552, fol., Paris, is the first one in which Comines' chronicle has the title "Memoires" and is the one referred to by Milton (See Commonplace Book, page 67).

⁸⁶ The first and only edition was published in Geneva, 1644. The complete title is "Histoire ecclesiastique des églises reformées, recueillies en quelque vallées de Piedmont et circonvoisines autrefois appelées vaudoises."

⁸⁷ *Geneanthropeiae, sive de Hominis Generatione Decateuchon*, Romae, 1642, fol. This was the only edition published before 1652.

MISCELLANEOUS ENTRIES

A (probably before 1644)

58. Hardyng, Chronicle⁹⁵ (242).
59. *Historia Scotie* (186⁹⁶).
60. Sesellius (Claude de Seyssel), *De Monarchia Francie*⁹⁷ (186,⁹⁸ 242⁹⁹).
61. Cuspinus, *De Caesaris atque Imperatoribus Romanis*¹⁰⁰ (151, 181,¹⁰¹ 186,¹⁰² 190,¹⁰³ 193).
62. Purchas, *Pilgrimes*¹⁰⁴ (13,¹⁰⁵ 57¹⁰⁶).
63. Campion, *History of Ireland*¹⁰⁷ (74¹⁰⁸).

⁹⁵ Two editions, published in 1543, were the only ones available to Milton. The entry appears to be contemporaneous with those from Holinshed, Camden etc. on this page (Nos. 39, 44).

⁹⁶ Indefinite reference. Either Boethius or Buchanan is probably meant. Cf. scribal entry on page 189 (No. 107). The note is perhaps simultaneous with the Holinshed-Girard group on this page (Nos. 37, 65, 53).

⁹⁷ Translated from the French by Sleidanus in 1545. The original is entitled "*La grand monarchie de France*," 1519.

⁹⁸ Apparently contemporaneous with first Thuanus entry (Book 57) and with the Cuspinian note (See Nos. 52, 61). The Speed-Camden group (Nos. 38, 44) on this page is in a paler brown ink.

⁹⁹ Crowded before an entry from Speed (No. 38).

¹⁰⁰ Milton's references to the folio edition published at Frankfurt, 1601, "*cum Wolphgangi Hungeri I. C. annotationibus*."

¹⁰¹ Probably contemporaneous with the Holinshed entries at the foot of the page (No. 37).

¹⁰² Apparently written at the same time as the Sesellius entries on this page (No. 59).

¹⁰³ Earlier than the Justinian notes (No. 71).

¹⁰⁴ Milton's references fit the first edition, London, 1625.

¹⁰⁵ This entry apparently belongs with that from Jovius (No. 48).

¹⁰⁶ This entry perhaps belongs with the Holinshed note at top of page.

¹⁰⁷ Milton must have used both Campion and Spenser (No. 64) in "*The History of Ireland*, collected by three learned authors, viz. Meredith Hanmer . . . Edmund Campion and Edmund Spenser." Dublin, 1633. His references fit the separate pagination of the two authors in this publication.

64. Spenser, *A View of the State of Ireland*¹⁰⁹ (188,¹¹⁰ 242¹¹⁰).
65. Bacon, *A Discourse of Church Affairs*¹¹¹ (184).
66. Raleigh, *History of the World* (114¹¹²).
67. Chaucer,¹¹³ *Canterbury Tales: Merchant's* (109¹¹⁴);
Wife of Bath's (150, 191); *Physician's* (111).
68. Chaucer, *Romaunt of the Rose* (191).
69. Gower, *Confessio Amantis*¹¹⁵ (243).
70. Selden, *De Jure Naturali et Gentium juxta Disciplinam
Hebraeorum*¹¹⁶ (110¹¹⁷).

¹⁰⁸ The notes apparently belong to a later stratum than those from Holinshed and Speed (Nos. 37, 38).

¹⁰⁹ For the edition see Campion (No. 63).

¹¹⁰ Perhaps contemporaneous with the Group II authors on these pages. The two Spenser notes were apparently made at the same time.

¹¹¹ Milton must refer to the London reprint of 1641, which alone carries this title. The original is "Certain Considerations touching the Better Pacification of the Church of England," 1604. The quotation is used in *Areopagitica*, but Bacon's remark about licencing books had already been noted by Milton when he wrote *Animadversions* in 1641 (See P. W., I, 189), and the entry was doubtless made in that year. It is later than the Malmesbury-Stow citation at the top of the page (Nos. 35, 36), being in a different and browner ink.

¹¹² This entry is apparently later than those from Holinshed on page 109-110 and contemporary with those from Thuanus, Book 35, on page 114. It is probably later than the entries from Book 71 of Thuanus on page 114, which are written with a finer pen (See Nos. 37, 51, 52).

¹¹³ All the Chaucer entries fit Speght's edition, London, 1596, and its duplicate of 1602. This fact determines the Chaucer canon so far as Milton is concerned. Milton had been familiar with Chaucer from his youth (Cf. *Il Penseroso*, 109 ff.). "The Plowman's Tale" is quoted in *Of Reformation* (1641). It is evident that the Common-place Book entries were made together, presumably in the early 40's.

¹¹⁴ Earlier than the entry from Leunclavius (No. 75), which is crowded before it.

¹¹⁵ Milton used Berthelette's edition, London, 1532. Gower is quoted in *Apology* (1641/2) (See P. W. I, 321).

¹¹⁶ Only one edition published in Milton's life. London, 1640. Sel-

71. Justinian, *Institutiones Juris Civilis*¹¹⁸ (113, 179, 182, 190).

72. Bodin, *De Republica* (112).

73. Peter Martyr (Pietro Martire of Vermigli), *In Librum Judicum* (185¹¹⁹).

74. Caesar, *Commentaries* (109¹²⁰).

B (probably after 1643)

75. Leunclavius, *Jus Graeco-Romanum*¹²¹ (109,¹²² 112,¹²³ 182).

76. Selden, *Uxor Ebraica* (109¹²⁴).

den is quoted in the second edition of *Doctrine and Discipline* (1643/4) and in *Areopagitica* (1644).

¹¹⁷ Apparently later than the Holinshed entry at top of page.

¹¹⁸ The Justinian notes, on whatever page they occur, are uniform in appearance and are pretty clearly contemporaneous entries. The position of the title "De Servis" (113) suggests that the entries antedate the Raleigh note (No. 66) under "De Matrimonio" (114). They are later than the Savonarola entry (119) and the Cuspinian entry (190) (See Nos. 33, 61). The fact that Milton makes no citations on divorce, though he had evidently carefully studied the subject in the *Institutes* before writing *Tetrachordon* (1644/5) and once refers to Justinian in the first edition of *Doctrine and Discipline* (1643), also points to a date before 1643 for these entries.

¹¹⁹ Apparently simultaneous with the Holinshed-Stow-Smith entries (Nos. 37, 36, 39) on this page. Peter Martyr is cited in *Tetrachordon* (1644/5), *Judgment of Martin Bucer* (1644) and *Tenure of Kings* (1649). The last citation (P. W. II, 472) is to the passage indicated in the Commonplace Book.

¹²⁰ Earlier than entry from Girard, Book I (No. 53).

¹²¹ Milton's references fit the Frankfurt folio of 1576, the first edition and the only one available in Milton's time. The note on page 112 is elaborated and discussed in *Tetrachordon* (1644/5). The general subject is treated in *Doctrine and Discipline*, Book I, chap. viii, without use of this passage. I therefore infer the note to have been made in 1644.

¹²² Crowded before Chaucer entry (No. 67).

¹²³ Earlier than Berni entry in Milton's hand (No. 81).

¹²⁴ The earliest possible date for this entry is fixed by the publication of Selden's work in 1646. Milton cites it as a divorce authority in *Defensio Secunda* (1655), and he employs the passage cited here in *Likeliest Means* (1659).

77. Von Herberstein (Sigismund), *Rerum Moscoviticarum Commentarii* ¹²⁵ (112).

78. Tassoni, *Pensieri* (189 ¹²⁶).

79. Boccalini, *De' Ragguagli di Parnasso* (189 ¹²⁶).

80. Thomasinus Paduanus, *Vita Petrarchi* (189 ¹²⁶).

81. Berni, *Orlando Inamorato Rifatto* (182 ¹²⁷).

C (date uncertain)

82. Schickhard, *Jus Regium Hebraeorum* (186 ¹²⁸).

83. Gildas, *De Excidio Britanniae* ¹²⁹ (114, ¹³⁰ 195 ¹³¹).

84. Spelman, *Concilia, Decreta etc . . . in Re Ecclesiastica Orbis Britanniae* ¹³² (?) (183).

85. Sidney, *Arcadia* ¹³³ (16, 17, 187, 188).

¹²⁵ A marginal jotting without specific reference, "Baro. ab Herber. de Mosch.", opposite to and probably contemporaneous with the note from Thuanus, Book 72 (No. 52).

¹²⁶ These entries (Nos. 79-81) apparently constitute a simultaneous group, later than the Sarpi entry which begins the page (No. 49).

¹²⁷ A later addition to the note from Leunclavius (No. 76).

¹²⁸ The passage is worked up in *Defensio* (P. W. vi, 59). The entry is in a paler ink than the Holinshed-Girard citations (Nos. 37-53).

¹²⁹ Milton's references fit the edition of Gildas contained in Commelinus' "Rerum Brittanicarum, id est Angliae, Scotiae, Variorum-que Insularum ac Regionum Scriptores," Heidelberg, 1587. This publication contains also the histories of Geoffrey of Monmouth, Ponticius Verunius, Bede, Guilelmus Novericensis, and an epitome of Froissart.

¹³⁰ Later than Raleigh note (No. 66).

¹³¹ This entry begins a third page under the title "Rex," pages 181 and 182 having presumably already been filled and many of the intervening pages written on. The note is followed only by amanuensis entries on this page.

¹³² The entry is as follows: "If the Pope be not greater than a council, then is no king to be thought greater than the Parliament. See de Conciliis." I have no assurance that the reference is to Spelman. The first volume of the *Concilia* was published in 1639. Milton refers to Spelman in the *History of Britain* (P. W., iii, 143).

¹³³ Milton's citations fit the edition of 1621, also the duplicates of 1623 and 1638. He had doubtless known and admired the "vain and

86. Guillim (John), *A Display of Heraldry*¹³⁴ (191).
87. Ward (Robert), *Animadversions of Warre, or a Military Magazine of Rules and Instructions for the Managing of Warre*¹³⁵ (18).
88. Theodoretus, *Historia Ecclesiastica* (53,¹³⁶ 243¹³⁷).
89. Basil, *Homiliae*¹³⁸: In Psalmum I (57¹³⁹); In Hexameron VIII (55¹⁴⁰); In Principium Proverborum (185).
90. Chrysostom, In Genesim *Homiliae* (5,¹⁴¹ 151).
91. Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia Ecclesiastica* (111¹⁴²).
92. Gregory of Nyssa, *De Virginitate*¹⁴³ (109).
93. Guicciardini, *Historia d'Italia*¹⁴⁴ (182, 190).

amatorious poem " from his youth (Cf. *Arcopagitica*, P. W., II, 417). The citations, which are from Books 2 and 4, evidently belong later than the Group II entries. We may perhaps trace a connection between the evidences in these notes of a careful and meditative re-reading of the work and Milton's discovery of King Charles' plagiarism (P. W., I, 346).

¹³⁴ Milton's reference fits the second and third editions, London, 1632 and 1638.

¹³⁵ Folio, London, 1639. There was no other edition of this work. The entry is later than Lactantius (No. 31).

¹³⁶ This entry, made on the same line with one from Eusebius (No. 1), perhaps belong before 1639, but see next note.

¹³⁷ Certainly later than 1639, being an addition to a note from Holinshed.

¹³⁸ Milton's references are to the two volume folio of the *Opera*, Paris, 1618.

¹³⁹ Later than entry from Bede (No. 34).

¹⁴⁰ Added at a later time to entry from Smith (No. 39). The passage is quoted in *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* (1648/9) (P. W., II, 466).

¹⁴¹ Chrysostom is not named in this citation. The passage used is in the twelfth homily. The entry may be contemporaneous with that from Lactantius at the top of the page (No. 32).

¹⁴² The writing would appear to indicate for this note, added to a Dante entry (No. 12), a date after 1639, but it may belong to the Horton period.

¹⁴³ Milton's reference fits the Paris edition of 1639.

¹⁴⁴ Milton's references fit the quarto of 1636, "di nuovo riveduta et corretta per Francesco Sansovino."

- 94. Tasso, *Gerusalemme Liberata*¹⁴⁵ (71).
- 95. Villani, *Chroniche di Firenze* (12).
- 96. Codinus (Curopalata), *De Officiis Magnae Ecclesiae et Aulae Constantinopolitanae*¹⁴⁶ (181).
- 97. Frontinus, *Strategmata* (19¹⁴⁷).
- 98. Rivetus (André Rivet), *Praelectiones in Exodum*,¹⁴⁸ Cap. XX (160).

AUTHORS ENTERED AFTER CIRCA 1650 (IN HANDS OF
AMANUENSES)

FIRST GROUP (Amanuensis A)

The entries in this group are pretty obviously in one hand. Horwood suggests comparison of the writing with that of the sonnet to Vane in the Cambridge MS. (1652) and with the inscription dictated by Milton in the Album of Christopher Arnold in 1651 (Sotheby, XIII, 1), but I can feel no assurance regarding these identifications. There is, however, one piece of scribal writing in the Milton documents not known to Sotheby or Horwood, which is almost certainly the work of this amanuensis: viz., the Italian sonnet copied on page 28 of Milton's copy of the *Rime* of Giovanni della Casa, now in the possession

¹⁴⁵ Milton had no doubt long since become acquainted with the *Gerusalemme*. See introductory note to *Mansus*, probably written in 1645.

¹⁴⁶ Codinus was first published by Francis Junius in 1588 and a Paris text had appeared in 1625. We know, however, from Milton's own statement (See below, p. 284), that he began to purchase as it was issued from the Paris press the great series of "*Byzantinae Historiae Scriptores*," in which Codinus was issued in 1648. This may account for a late return to Byzantine history in Milton's reading.

¹⁴⁷ Later than the Holinshed note at the top of this page.

¹⁴⁸ Milton's reference does not fit the reprint of this tract in the Rotterdam edition of Rivet's works, 1651 ff. The separate editions (1632, 1637) are not accessible to me.

of the New York Public Library. Mr. Paltsitz, Keeper of Manuscripts in the New York Library, who has been so kind as to compare the Commonplace Book entries with the writing in the della Casa volume, confirms my judgment as to the identity of the two hands. The fact that the Commonplace Book contains another entry from Berni (No. 81) written by Milton himself, suggests the possibility that the block of reading represented in Group I may have been done just before his blindness became complete. As I shall show in connection with Group II, the Machiavelli entries seem also to be associated with the early '50's.

99. Berni, Orlando Inamorato Rifatto (71, 187).

100. Boiardo, Orlando Inamorato (77, 187).

SECOND GROUP (*Amanuensis B*).

The two entries on page 197 are certainly not, as Horwood supposed, in the hands of Daniel Skinner, who recopied the first part of the Christian Doctrine manuscript and handled Milton's papers after his death. Skinner's hand, as seen in Sotheby's facsimiles (plates xx-xxiii), is much more regular than this. It has, moreover, an obviously different formation of the letters "e," "R," "f," "t," etc. Indeed, the hands have only the most superficial resemblance, and later students of Milton would not have accepted Horwood's assertion without question had they taken the trouble to compare them. I should judge, though not without hesitation, that the writing is that of Edward Philips (see specimen in Sotheby, plate xxiv).

The entries obviously belong in point of time with those of Group III. See below for a discussion of the probable date.

101. Machiavelli, *Discorsi sopra la Prima Deca di Tito Livio* (197).

THIRD GROUP ("Machiavelli scribes," several hands?)

I am unable to decide how many hands are represented in these entries. They are all the work of careful writers and have many similarities. The notes from Book I, chapters 58-9 on pages 185, 245, and 198, those from Book II, chapters 10 and 12 on pages 148, 242, and 243, and those from the later chapters of Book II and from Book III on pages 242, 243 and 198 constitute three units, representing, it would appear, successive sets of simultaneous entries, perhaps by the same scribe. The notes from Book I, chapters 2-10 on pages 193, 195, and 246 are more probably the work of a different, earlier hand. If we assume the reading to have been done consecutively (and the notes show almost conclusively that it was) Amanuensis B must have come in for a brief period, probably for a single session, shortly after the work was begun, since his entries refer to Book I, chapter 10. The index entry to the page written by him, inserted with the other titles at the close of the Commonplace Book, is in the hand of one of the other Machiavelli scribes. We seem here to have come to very close quarters with Milton in his use of literary assistance. One wonders who were the four or five persons who could read to him in Italian and write notes in Italian and Latin—fluently, since the appearance of these entries and those of Amanuensis A, D, and F forbids us to suppose that the notes were dictated *literatim*.

The fact that no recognizable echo of any of these entries, some of them markedly anti-tyrannical in character, appears in *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* (1648/9), whereas the *Discorsi* constitute an important

source of *Ready and Easy Way* (1660), affords some evidence as to the date of the Machiavelli groups. The entry from Machiavelli on page 243, concerning money as the "nerves of war," is perhaps connected with line 8 of the Vane sonnet, "move by its two main nerves, iron and gold." The passage on "successio," page 195, seems to find an echo in *Ready and Easy Way* (30, 25).

102. Machiavelli, *Discorsi* (148, 243, 198, 242, 185, 195, 243, 245, 246).

FOURTH GROUP (*Amanuensis C*)

This group of entries is the work of the scribe who wrote the second part of the *Christian Doctrine* manuscript (Sotheby, plates xx-xxiii), the Milton signature on a conveyance to Cyricak Skinner, dated May 7, 1660 (Sotheby, plate xxiii, iv), the last entries in Milton's family Bible (*Milton Facsimiles*, published by the British Museum, 1908), and the transcript of the sonnet, "Methought I saw my late espoused saint," in the Cambridge MS. Now the two Bible entries record events of the years 1652 and 1657, but they were evidently made together after the death of Milton's second wife in 1657. The sonnet was composed and presumably copied in 1658. We have, then, the definite indication of a period during which Milton was making use of the services of this scribe, *i. e.*, circa 1657-8. There is, as I have shown elsewhere (*Studies in Philology*, July, 1920, pp. 309 ff.), no reason to think the *Christian Doctrine* transcript much later. We may, therefore, assume that the Group IV entries belong also to this period. The entry from Rivet bears a rather striking resemblance to the satirical passage on "the masterpiece of a modern politician" in *Of Reformation* (1641) (P. W., I, 34), but the similarities may well

be accidental. The Commonplace Book entry is unlikely to be as early as 1641. It is the last piece of writing on the page, spaced evenly with the preceding notes, one of which is from Thuanus (No. 52). Milton had, however, become acquainted with Rivet's biblical commentary before 1643 (see *Doctrine and Discipline*, chap. iv).

103. Rivetus, *Commentarii in Exodum* (188).

104. Augustine, *De Civitate Dei* (195).

FIFTH GROUP (Amanuensis D)

This is, as Horwood observes, undoubtedly the hand which made the extant transcript of the first book of *Paradise Lost* (Sotheby, plate xxv). The transcript is presumably a duplicate for record of the press transcript itself, written, perhaps, just before the work was presented to the licenser in 1667. The entry is later than the two entries from Machiavelli in the hand of Amanuensis B. A date after 1647 is established for the Nicetas entry by the publication of the first edition of that author. We know that Milton owned a copy of the work before 1658.¹⁴⁹ He had, of course, become familiar with the Purgatorio at least as early as the sonnet to Harry Lawes (1646).

105. Dante, *Purgatorio* (197).

¹⁴⁹ Epistle XXI. (Since Milton lists the items in the *Byzantinae Historiae Scriptores* which were not at that time in his library we can, by referring to Fabricius' account of the edition (*Bib. Graec.*, vii, 520 ff.) definitely name some dozen folio volumes which he possessed. These include, besides Nicetas and Codinus (See No. 96), the histories of Theophylactus, Georgius Monachus, Nicephoras Patriarcha, Nicephoras Caesariensis, Cedrenus, Anna Comnena, Georgius Acropolita, Cantacuzenus, Laonicus, Duca, the *Excerpta de Legationibus*, and the *Notitia Dignitatum*, all of which had appeared before 1658.

106. Nicetas Acominatus, *Imperii Graeci Historia*¹⁵⁰ (249).

SIXTH GROUP (Amanuensis E)

This badly written and badly spelled entry is later than the note from Machiavelli on page 198. Milton very probably studied Buchanan as early as the period of the entries from the English chronicles. He uses him throughout the prose.

107. Buchanan, *Rerum Scoticarum Historia*¹⁵¹ (198).

SEVENTH GROUP (Amanuensis F).

Horwood is, I think, mistaken in supposing these notes to be the work of the Christian Doctrine Scribe (Amanuensis C). I find no writing similar to this in the Milton materials. The Costanzo entry on page 248 begins a second title "Tyrannus," and must therefore be later than the Group III entries from Thuanus, etc., on page 185. Page 248 is the next to the last page of the volume.

108. Sigonius, *De Imperio Occidentali* (19, 181).

109. Costanzo (Angelo di), *Historio del Regno di Napoli*¹⁵² (5, 248).

The results of my attempt to chronologize the commonplace Book materials on the basis of manuscript evidence are now complete. In spite of the indefiniteness of some of the data, it is clear that there need no longer be uncertainty regarding the document as a whole. The assump-

¹⁵⁰ Milton's page references fit the Paris folio of 1647 (see note 149, above).

¹⁵¹ Milton cites "Edit. Edinburg," i. e. that of 1582, but, as Horwood observes, the page reference should be 131 and not 403.

¹⁵² Milton's references fit the pagination of the edition published at Aquila by Giuseppe Caccio, 1581, and the duplicate of this, ib., 1582.

tion of Horwood that the majority of the entries were made before Milton's Italian journey (1638-9) is certainly erroneous. Less than a third of the total number of authors and a much smaller proportion of the material itself were entered before this time. It remains true, however, that the Commonplace Book in general belongs to the earlier part of Milton's career, and the document is the more interesting on this account. Beginning, presumably, about 1636, Milton made fairly free notations until 1639, returning to the work with increased attention in 1639/40 and noting observations from his reading with great fullness in the year or two immediately following. A majority of all the entries belong to the first three years of Milton's middle period (1640 ff.). After 1644 Milton made only occasional additions to the notes. It is clear, however, that he continued to attach importance to the volume and frequently consulted it. We may assume, perhaps, that the later group of entries in Milton's autograph belongs in the main to the very end of the period in which he still had the use of his eyes (before 1652), his failing sight again furnishing a reason for his wishing again to record a few notabilia to which he might later have difficulty in referring in the volumes themselves. The most extensive portion of the scribal entries was apparently dictated in the early fifties, and none of them are demonstrably later than the Restoration.

The inference from these facts would seem to be that Milton used the volume in the main for general intellectual preparation for later work, and this observation is borne out by the character of the entries themselves. They are in no sense, as we have seen, notes set down for immediate use in controversial or learned writing. Thus the citations from the Chronicles do not constitute the mate-

rials for the *History of Britain*,¹⁵³ nor could Milton at the time when he wrote them have definitely foreseen the occasion for their use in such works as the first and second *Defensio*, the *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*, and the *Ready and Easy Way*. Similarly the earlier entries from the church historians and the fathers, though they are employed in the ecclesiastical tracts, were not the product of research engaged in during the course of this controversy. It is genuinely surprising that the special study which Milton must have undertaken in writing the prose works leaves so little trace in the Commonplace Book. The exception in the case of the divorce entries from Sarpi, Leunclavius, Thuanus, and the French histories (Nos. 49, 75, 52, 53, 54) is more apparent than real. These were not, strictly speaking, Milton's divorce authorities, and from the authors which he actually investigated after the first edition of *Doctrine and Discipline* (1643) in search of support for his theory—Beza, Bucer, etc.—there are no citations in the notes. The inference would seem to be that the reading from Commonplace Book authorities was done as part of a program of independent study and that the notes on divorce were entered, like those from the same writers under other heads, simply because of Milton's general and continued interest in the topic.

All this is highly suggestive as to Milton's method in the use of books, and it affords strong confirmation of the

¹⁵³ Naturally there are many parallels between the notes from the English chronicles and the *History* (see Horwood's list). But in no case does Milton in the Commonplace Book raise questions of fact or of the credibility of his authorities, points which in making a comparative study of the sources for his history he must have been primarily concerned with. See Firth, *loc. cit.* and especially Harry Glicksman, "The Sources of Milton's *History of Britain*" (*Wisconsin Studies in Lang. and Lit.*, XI, 104 ff.).

natural supposition that the *Commonplace Book* authors were in general thoroughly read as being worth while in themselves. The list, therefore, becomes of greater significance for the history of Milton's intellectual development than a more miscellaneous one would be, compiled from the references in his published works. It is unnecessary to remark that this list, as representing those writers, independent of the classics and of Scripture, in which Milton was most deeply interested, is incomplete. Milton's habit of citation is comparatively sparing; the scope of subject matter appropriate to the plan of the *Commonplace Book* was limited; and we must remember, too, that he kept at least one other set of learned notes, an *Index Theologicus*, referred to several times in the *Commonplace Book*, corresponding to the *Index Ethicus*, *Oeconomicus*, and *Politicus* of that volume.

It remains to consider some of the wider applications of the data thus far given. Without attaching too high a degree of certainty to any particular conclusion set down in connection with the chronological analysis, it is possible in the light of it and by reference to the known facts of Milton's life, to give a fairly detailed account of one large division of his studies and to fill some important gaps in his inner biography. Mark Pattison, speaking of the Horton period (1632-1638), deplores the fact that Milton kept no diary of his reading. "Of these years," he remarks, "the biographer would gladly give a minute account." But the Horton years, if we attend to all the evidence regarding them, are anything but dark. The outstanding inference from the *Commonplace Book* is that Milton began, during the period of his retirement, a clearly conceived program of historical study, to be continued with characteristic fidelity and thoroughness well

into the period of his middle life. The reasons for his doing so are clear enough. His time at the University must have been pretty well occupied with the regular academic exercises then in vogue and with independent studies mainly classical. We know that he was profoundly dissatisfied with the curriculum as an instrument of liberal education. In *The Reason of Church Government* he complains, in true humanistic fashion, that honest and ingenious natures, who came to the University "to store themselves with good and solid learning," were filled with nothing else but "the scragged and thorny lectures of a miserable sophistry." His own scheme of education, a humanistic substitute for the mediævalism and pedantry of the university method, is founded on the principle that languages are acquired as a means to the study of "the solid things in them," and that disputation must be subsequent to the acquisition of a competent command of all the fields of knowledge, particularly of the tradition of those peoples who have been "most industrious after wisdom." To Milton, surveying his own accomplishment at the close of his Cambridge career, and contemplating the lofty ideals which he had always held up for his own attainment, the defects in his equipment would have been obvious, and his reason for wishing to continue the life of a student under his own guidance at Horton must have been primarily a resolve to make them good by a more exclusive attention to the "solid things." It was the very essence of his purpose that his studies should be shaped to no immediate practical application. To say this is not to deny that one guiding motive of his life was to write a work which after times should not willingly let die. But he knew that such an end would be best served indirectly through the development of his

faculties and by the broad contemplation of human life in the light of the records of the past. For such a purpose, as well as for the more general one of spiritual and intellectual leadership in which it was involved, the study of history and literature was all important. He spent his time, he tells us, in reading ("evolvendis") Greek and Latin writers.¹⁵⁴ This doubtless means that he reread those classics with which he had long since been familiar, but I suspect that he then made his first acquaintance with some of the later and more obscure authors. We know that he purchased and annotated at that time the works of Lycophron and Heraclitus the Mythographer, while the reference in *Il Penseroso* bears witness to his study of Hermes Trismegistus.¹⁵⁵ He doubtless also read more widely in English literature, he certainly pursued the study of mathematics and of music, and finally, at some time during the five-year period he undertook an ambitious course of historical reading, proceeding chronologically.

The earlier authors read under this systematic program are not recorded in the Commonplace Book. A statement in the *Apology for Smectymnuus* (1642), however, supplies a comprehensive description of the study and suggests one of the purposes which animated it: "Some years I had spent in the stories of those Greek and Roman exploits, wherein I found many things nobly done, and worthily spoken; when coming in the method of time to that age wherein the Church had obtained a Christian

¹⁵⁴ Not "turning over the Greek and Latin classics," as sometimes quoted.

¹⁵⁵ Milton's autograph copy of Lycophron (see above, p. 256) bears the date 1634; the Heraclitus was purchased in 1637 (Sotheby, 125). The latter volume (Gesner's edition of 1544) contains also some material ascribed to Psellus. Hermes was included in Milton's ed. of Justin (See No. 26).

emperor, I so prepared myself, as being now about to read examples of wisdom and goodness among those who were foremost in the Church; but to the amazement of what I expected, Readers, I found it all quite contrary; excepting in some very few, nothing but ambition, corruption, contention, combustion: in so much that I could not but love the historian Socrates," etc. Milton had, then, begun with the history of classical antiquity, studying the chief authorities, we may suppose, exhaustively. For the rest, the Commonplace Book gives us the detail and confirms Milton's statement that the reading was done "in the method of time." He proceeded with the records of the early Church in the father of Church historians, Eusebius, in the works of his continuators, Socrates, Theodoret, Sozomen, and Evagrius, and in Sulpicius Severus, turning aside, whether in the midst of this part of his program or later, to study the writings of the Church Fathers themselves. The contemporary secular history of the Greek empire was represented by Procopius, and, in its later phases, down to the fall of Constantinople, by Cantacuzenus, Nicephoras, and Cedrenus. The history of the Western Empire through the Middle Ages was studied in the *Historia Miscella* and in the two works of Sigonius. For further confirmation of the systematic character of the program, with an indication of the direction it was subsequently to take, we may turn to the statement in Epistle VII to Diodati, dated September 23, 1637. I quote the Latin, which is sometimes mistranslated: "Graecorum res continua lectione deduximus usque quo illi Graeci esse desiti; Italorum in obscura re diu versati sumus sub Longobardis et Francis et Germanis, ad illud tempus quo illis ab Rudolpho Germaniae rege concessa libertas est; eunde quid quaeque civitas suo Marte gesserit

seperatim legere praestabit. . . . Interim quod sine tua molestia fiat Justinianum mihi Venetorum historicum rogo."¹⁵⁶

We have no means of knowing whether the intention of studying the history of the Italian cities was fulfilled in the interval between this letter and Milton's departure for Italy in 1638. The notes from Guicciardini, Villani, and Angelo di Constanzo (Nos. 92, 93, 109) are much later. There is, however, evidence in the entries from Ariosto and Dante (Nos. 16, 12, 13, 105) that Milton was renewing and extending his acquaintance with Italian literature.

If we turn now from the authorities which Milton studied during the Horton period to a consideration of the notes which he made from them, we find much that is of value as an index to his early interests and aims. It is not within the scope of this paper to discuss the entries in detail. They deserve to be carefully studied in their chronological relations, for they represent a phase of the early Milton which is generally ignored and for which we have little other specific data. It is evident that he maintained in pursuing the course of study which has been described, besides the general object of self-cultivation, a desire to acquire the materials for correct thinking on the large political and religious issues of the age, for Milton contemplated no activity as a poet which did not involve an intimate relation with the currents of life and thought in which he lived. Looking back on this period from a later time, he speaks of "many studious and contemplative years altogether spent in the search for religious and civil knowledge," and he remarks still more specifically in the *Second Defense* (1654): "I had from

¹⁵⁶ The period of Italian history here indicated is, as Horwood points out, that covered by Sigonius, *De Regno Italiae*.

my youth studied the distinctions between civil and religious rights." The early entries in the Commonplace Book bear out these statements.

A considerable number of them reflect the contemporary interest in questions of ecclesiastical custom and in the precedents and authorities regarding them, with a marked predilection for evidence in support of the more liberal Reformation practice. The Puritanism, or more properly the liberalism, of Milton was evidently of very early growth. A note on Constantine's giving the clergy immunity from civil office (171) and one praising the modesty of princes who refuse to meddle in matters of religion (181) show his fundamental convictions regarding the relations of church and state to have been already in process of formation. Even more striking are the political entries, which contain the gist of Milton's whole republicanism. In the earliest stratum a broad interest is manifested in the relation of prince and subject, as in the note on page 181: "*Ad subditos suos scribens Constantinus magnus nec alio nomine quam fratres appellat.*" In the later (Group II) the political materials are more obviously related to the issues of the day. Thus the title "*Rex*" is begun, with entries relative to the deification of the Roman emperors, and that of "*Subditus*," with two notes giving instances of Papal release of subjects from allegiance to a sovereign (183). The setting down of the title, "*Census et Vectigal*" (220) is evidently connected with interest in the illegal exactions of Charles. And finally one note is definitely republican: "*Severus Sulpitius ait regium nomen semper liberis gentibus fere invisum*" (182). Were it not for the unquestionable evidence of the manuscript we should have been inclined, I think, to ascribe this last citation rather to the period

of the *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* (1649) than to that of *Lycidas* (1637). It will be remembered that in all the pamphlets written before the condemnation of King Charles in 1648/9, Milton carefully avoids saying or implying anything against the royal prerogative, and that in the *Second Defense* he takes pains to point out that he had not done so. That this was not for want of meditations on the subject or of convictions regarding it, but from a sense of what public policy required from him, we now see.

Perhaps the most genuinely illuminating of all the notes are those on page 109 under the title "Matrimonium." In the discussions of Milton's ideas on marriage and of the relation of the divorce pamphlets to his personal experience, this material has never been given proper weight. The entries begin by citing precedent for marriage of the clergy and patristic approval of the honorableness of the married state. This, of course, is simply reformed opinion, and the entries may reflect the popular nervousness regarding the Romish tendencies of Laud, who in a speech before the King in 1632 had dropped remarks in disparagement of a married clergy, but there follows (Group II) an entry from Justin to the effect that the Jews allowed polygamy "propter varia mysteria sub ea latentia," which shows Milton to have been already interested in the more radical Protestant thought regarding freedom in marriage. There are, to be sure, no divorce entries in this period, but sixteenth-century polygamists (for example, Ochino) were also divorcers, and Milton's later opinion is but the logical outcome of his whole early trend of mind.¹⁵⁷

¹⁵⁷ A statement of the recently discovered early anonymous biographer confirms the conclusion that Milton's ideas on divorce were

These and other more miscellaneous evidences from the Commonplace Book of the degree to which Milton had matured and formed his thought by meditative reading long before he found himself actually surrounded by the influences which determined his career, are an invaluable assistance to us in arriving at a complete conception of the significance of the Horton period. Biographers have been too much inclined to make the tone of the "long vacation" depend on the data afforded by the poems alone. The Commonplace Book should warn us that the "lost Paradise" of the Horton period bears far more resemblance to Milton's later years than we are accustomed to suppose. It was an era of industrious preparation, no less for the services rendered to the Commonwealth than for the composition of *Paradise Lost*. Indeed, the two preparations, in his own thought of his career, were one. Far from being in the dark regarding this epoch, we have perhaps the most explicit account that any poet before the era of *biographia literaria* has ever given of his student years:—the classified statement of literary and aesthetic enthusiasms in *L'Allegro* and *Il Penseroso* the declaration of moral principle in *Comus*, the avowal of high ambition in *Lycidas*, and finally the record of humanistic thought and study in the Commonplace Book and in the annotated texts. The one gap is in our knowledge of the religious and theological movement of Milton's mind, and this

formulated under the influence of his early reading before his marriage with Mary Powell: "And therefore thought upon a Divorce, that hee might be free to marry another; concerning which hee also was in treaty. The lawfulness and expedience of this, duly regulat in order to all those purposes, for which marriage was at first instituted: had upon full consideration and reading good Authors bin formerly his Opinion." "The Earliest Life of Milton," ed. E. S. Parsons, *Colorado College Studies*, x, p. 12.

would probably have been filled had not the Index Theologicus unfortunately been lost.

For the remaining years the evidence of the Commonplace Book is less necessary and less valuable, but the chronology of the document is still of use in correcting false impressions. On his return to England in 1639, Milton did not, as is well known, plunge at once into the controversy of the time. He took up a way of life in London similar to that which he had followed at Horton, with the additional duty of instructing his nephews. "As soon as I was able," he writes, "I hired a spacious house in the city for myself and my books, where I again with rapture renewed my literary pursuits (*ad intermissa studia beatulus me recepi*)." The "interrupted studies" of the Horton period were evidently continued systematically and "in the method of time," though it is difficult to analyze this part of the program so precisely. The presence of the Lactantius notes in Group I is significant as indicating a first reading of or more probably a return to the one among the Church fathers whose ways of thought Milton found, I think, most congenial, and to whose philosophy he was most deeply indebted.¹⁵⁸ He records a disagreement, however, with Lactantius' condemnation of dramatic spectacles (241), and at the conclusion of his note makes a significant statement regarding the value of tragedy: "*quid enim in tota philosophia aut gravius aut sanctius aut sublimius tragoedia recte con-*

¹⁵⁸ The quotations in the Commonplace Book are strikingly in accord with Milton's doctrine of disciplined freedom as seen in the prose works. The passage on the use of temptation in strengthening character might well serve as text for much of the argument of the *Areopagitica*, and there is a passage in chapter 15 of the sixth book of the *Institutes* (not cited in Milton's notes) to which he seems to be indebted for some of his phraseology.

stituta quid utilius ad humanae vitae casus et conversationes uno intuitu spectandos." The idea and phraseology here are repeated in the preface to *Samson Agonistes*.¹⁵⁹ The entry from Savonarola suggests that Milton had now entered seriously on the study of the era of the Reformation. One of the chief sources of his knowledge was Sleidanus, but before 1644 he had evidently gone carefully through Sarpi, and, of course, had read to some extent the reformers themselves, though, except for Peter Martyr, their names are conspicuously absent from the Commonplace Book.¹⁶⁰ The larger occupation of the period immediately following his return from Italy in 1639 was, however, English and Scottish history, to which he now turned, so far as we know, for the first time,¹⁶¹ except that he had long been acquainted with the legendary material in Geoffrey. The first step was to work through Bede, Malmesbury, Holinshed, Speed, and Stowe, for the older period. The notes from the four last-named authorities are intermingled in the Commonplace Book, and we have confirmatory evidence in the Cambridge MS. that they constitute a reading unit.¹⁶² The two sets of notes

¹⁵⁹ "Tragedy, as it was anciently composed, hath been ever held the gravest, moralist, and most profitable of all other forms."

¹⁶⁰ The Index Theologicus would doubtless have contained them. Milton gives the impression in the Dedication to the *Christian Doctrine* of having studied exhaustively the systems of the Reformation divines.

¹⁶¹ Firth's assumption that Milton's studies in English history date from the Horton period is based on a misconception of the chronology of the Commonplace Book (Milton as a Historian, 227-8).

¹⁶² Bede is also once referred to in the list of British Tragedies, along with Geoffrey, both being recollected and referred to when the story of the slaughter of the monks of Bangor was met with in Holinshed (p. 104). The citations from the Scotch Chronicles (i. e. Holinshed's version of Boethius, to which Milton's page references apply) appear separate from and later than the others in the Cambridge MS.

were doubtless made at the same time, and they illustrate respectively Milton's intellectual and imaginative interest in the materials. But the study of English history for scholarly purposes extended beyond these simple narratives to Malmesbury and Bede of the older authorities, and to Camden, DuChesne and others among the moderns. The wide scope of the study is illustrated by the inclusion of citations from the writers on English political theory and law — Sir Thomas Smith, Lambard, and, probably also at this time, Spelman. The fruits of his comprehensive research were ultimately to be embodied in the *History of Britain*, but there is no reason for supposing the reading to have been done with this intention. The fact more probably is that the purpose of writing an English history grew out of the study, as the opening sentences of Milton's work suggest. When in 1646 he gave himself to this work he found it necessary to devote primary attention to a number of sources unrepresented in the Commonplace Book or quoted at second hand only — Nennius, the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, Henry of Huntington, Matthew Paris, Matthew of Westminster, Simeon of Durham, Bracton, and others.¹⁶³ On the other hand, Milton's historical sense and his philosophic point of view as shown in the incidental judgments of men and events had been in process of formation since the beginning of his systematic study in the Horton period.

No less inadequate is the idea that Milton was in this

¹⁶³ For an account of the sources of the *History* see the articles of Firth and Glicksman already alluded to. Milton is much influenced by Holinshed, as was natural. Firth shows that he follows him rather than Speed and Stowe in passages in which they are at variance. In the Commonplace Book the Speed and Stowe citations are generally used in a subsidiary way. Milton was well aware of the secondary character of all three chronicles, and his references in the *History* are wholly to the older and more reliable sources.

reading primarily searching for poetic materials. The jottings of literary subjects from the Chroniclers are simply incidental gleanings, made with little definite expectation of using any particular one of them. What he really aimed at was the enrichment and maturing of his mind through study, with a view both to the fulfillment of his ambition to write a poem "not to be raised from the heath of youth or the vapors of wine," and to the playing of a part in public events if occasion should require. Viewed in the light of this purpose, the commonplace Book is quite as important as a revelation of the process of preparation for *Paradise Lost* as is the Cambridge MS. It is a partial record of the "industrious and select reading," which, "with steady observation and insight into all seemly and generous arts and affairs," he held to be a prime requirement. The historical material probably surprised him by its richness, and it is not strange that we hear no more of the Arthurian epic after the time when Milton had become deeply interested in the non-legendary part of English story.

It is difficult to tell just how long these English studies continued. Very probably the course of Milton's program was interrupted or modified by his deliberate entry into the ecclesiastical controversy in the summer of 1641. "I determined," he writes in the *Second Defense*, "to relinquish the other pursuits in which I was engaged and to transfer the whole force of my talents and industry to this one important object." It is noteworthy that the authors who were of the greatest assistance to him were not those which he was then reading, but those which he had already worked through before the Italian journey. He doubtless turned to them again, but there is no evidence that he continued to set down observations based on them in the

Commonplace Book. The following passage from *The Reason of Church Government* (1641) helps to elucidate the situation, and its full bearing becomes clear in the light of the material here presented: "If I hunted after praise by the ostentation of wit and learning I should not write thus out of my own season, when I have neither yet completed to my mind the full circle of my private studies, although I complain not of any insufficiency to the matter in hand," his confidence on the latter point being, of course, grounded on the consciousness of having covered with thoroughness in the Horton period the origins and early history of the Church.

The character of the notes made from this first stratum of reading in English history is a sufficient indication of the detached attitude of mind which Milton held toward it. Besides continuing the earlier topics of miscellaneous interest and beginning others, Milton expands the items of political philosophy in great detail, with a manifestly increasing application of his reading to the general state of public affairs, though not to the immediate ecclesiastical issue. New pages are begun with the significant titles "Tyrannus" (248), "Rex Angliae" (186), "Rapina seu Extorsio Publica" (221), the last containing entries pointedly contemporary in significance. A body of particularly careful notes tracing English constitutional precedent for the subjection of the king to law is set down on page 179. Clearly Milton was well prepared in thought, long before he could definitely have foreseen them, for the coming events of English history and for the rôle he was to play from 1648 to 1655 as a defender of the Revolution. The notes relative to the philosophy of marriage are also continued, and an item from Bacon, probably made before 1641, on the unwisdom of prohibiting books, shows very

clearly that the sources of Milton's defense of the freedom of the press (1644) lie deep in his early reading and tends to minimize the merely personal and occasional element in the work.¹⁶⁴ In general, these entries afford abundant evidence that Milton had developed by 1641 a remarkably coherent body of ideas, involving fixed views on a wide variety of topics—and that he had already acquired a firm grasp on the substance of works which were yet unwritten.

From 1641 Milton was much engaged in controversy and his study must have been shaped to the various issues with which he had to deal. We have in the *Areopagitica* (1644) a striking statement of the thoroughness of his ideals of research. Yet he evidently refused to allow himself to be altogether warped out of his course. In the *Apology for Smectymnuus* (1642) speaking of the councils of the Church, Milton says that he has looked into them all but read them only here and there, and adds "If I want anything yet I shall reply that which in the defense of Muraena was answered by Cicero to Sulpitius the lawyer, If ye provoke me, (for at no hand else will I undertake such a frivolous labour) I will undertake in three months to be an expert councilist." Happily the Remonstrant desisted and spared Milton the frivolous labor of the

¹⁶⁴ The degree to which Milton's convictions on this subject antedate the composition of *Areopagitica* and the order of Parliament which occasioned it has been too little regarded by the editors of the tract. Beside the Bacon passage on page 184 of the Commonplace Book Milton has set down on page 53 certain ideas from the Church historians which he at the very center of his argument (See Socrates, No. 1, Eusebius, No. 3 and Theodoretus, No. 88). The anecdote concerning Dionysius contained in Eusebius (No. 1) is worked up in *Areopagitica*, P. W., II, 409. But we do not have to rely on the Commonplace Book alone for evidences of Milton's early interest employed in his defence. See the passage in *Of Reformation* (1641), P. W., I, 29.

councils. In considering the question of Milton's intellectual occupations during the Commonwealth we must remember that much of the materials of the prose tracts came from authors with whom he was already familiar or whom he was then reading on more general grounds of interest, also that the tracts appear to have been written very rapidly, with considerable periods of leisure intervening. Thus five of the ecclesiastical pamphlets were composed in the single year 1641, and *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* (1648/9) could have occupied Milton but a few weeks at most,¹⁶⁵ the materials, as we have seen, being already at hand as a result of the political studies recorded in the Commonplace Book since 1639 and before. As a matter of fact, even in some of the years of greatest productivity, we seem to see Milton continuing his independent study. The study of French history and political philosophy in De Thou, Girard, Comines and perhaps Sesellius (Nos. 52, 53, 54, 60) an evident continuation of the original project, appears to coincide with the period in which Milton was most busily occupied with the later divorce tracts.

There is, moreover, the miscellaneous reading—from Gower, Sidney, Chaucer, and Machiavelli's *Art of War*—which cannot be exactly dated, but some of which was certainly done amid the barbarous and distracting noise of public dispute. Perhaps we have attached too much importance to Milton's impatient complaint of the disturbing influences which surrounded him. The Commonplace Book would seem to show that he continued to pursue with freedom the path of liberal study and meditation which

¹⁶⁵ He states in the *Second Defense* that he was led to write it because of the Presbyterian clamor which arose after the trial of Charles and before the execution. The trial took place the last of January and Milton's pamphlet was out in February.

led to *Paradise Lost*. His use of Von Herberstein and other authorities on Russia (Jovius, Thuanus, and Purchas) is particularly interesting as indicating the broad scope which his plan of study continued to exhibit. The entries, too, are suggestive of a mind not altogether bent to the pressing issues of the time. Thus in the notes included in Group III we have beside the political observations and the exempla of "divorce at will," a number of entries of purely liberal and academic character: one on the foundation by Englishmen of the universities of Paris and Padua (53), and one on the need of fostering humane culture "in medio etiam bellorum aestu" (53). There are also two notes from Girard on the history of music, continuing a topic begun in the Horton period. The continuity of Milton's interests remains unbroken, though there is a progressive widening of the scope, especially of his political reflection.

A very valuable addition to the evidence of this sort is afforded by the later Italian entries, which I would gladly date with more precision. Milton's return to this field took place certainly before 1652. Possibly the entries represent a more or less continuous occupation throughout his public life with the literature to which he owed so much of literary inspiration. The notes in the commonplace Book are certainly later than the period of the ecclesiastical and divorce tracts (1641-5), however, and I believe them to belong to the years 1650-52. Among the authors read are, besides the histories of the Italian cities, the satirical writings of Tassoni and Boccacini, Tasso, and the rifacimento of Boiardo, probably also Petrarch, since Milton quotes a life of him, and, if we suppose the amanuensis entries to belong to the same period, Giovanni della Casa, and the *Orlando Innamorato* itself. The notes deal

with such detached matters as the occasional permissibility of falsehood (71) and the study of law (not a liberal art, "ma mestiere, ed arte veramente mechanica, nel mondo introdutta per affligere il genere humano" (189)).

The dictated material on the Commonplace Book, aside from the evidence it affords of Milton's later occupation with the Italians, adds little to our knowledge of his mind.¹⁶⁶ The study of Machiavelli's *Discorsi* connects with Milton's interest in politics and served his turn in *Ready and Easy Way* (1660), though the entries reflect rather the kind of speculation which had already received practical application in *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* (1648-9). The Dante entry in the *Paradise Lost* hand is from the *Purgatorio*, whereas those made in the Horton period were from the *Inferno* and the *Paradiso*. The two last named books alone are referred to in *Reason of Church Government* (1641), although the authority of Dante on the separation of Church and State is more clearly stated in the passage here copied out from the *Purgatorio*. Can it be that a discriminating Puritanism made Milton pass over the second part of Dante's epic in his first reading? In reality the human atmosphere of Purgatory is far more congenial with Milton's thought than that of either Hell or Paradise, and it is interesting to find him rereading the second book of the *Comedia*, perhaps in the very period when he was undertaking the actual composition of *Paradise Lost* (1658). His appreciation had already been

¹⁶⁶ The isolated reference to St. Augustine's *De Civitati Dei* (No. 104), which was probably set down circa 1658, is interesting in view of the very remarkable agreement of the interpretation of the fall of man set forth in this work with Milton's treatment of the theme in *Paradise Lost*. For an excellent discussion of Milton's special esteem for, and indebtedness to St. Augustine see Denis Saurat, *La Pensée de Milton*, pp. 264-271.

recorded in the exquisite close of the sonnet to Harry Lawes.

This entry, with that from Nicetas Acominatus under the heading "De Re Nautica," are in all probability the last set down by Milton in the volume which he had maintained so carefully and for so many years. They conclude a list of reading, varied and yet coherent, which corresponds in a striking way, for the modern period, with the program of humane culture through the classics which Milton outlines for younger students in the tractate on Education (1644), having for its generous object the same that is described in the famous definition—the more complete fitting of this man "to perform justly, skillfully, and magnanimously all the offices both public and private of peace and war." The total effect of the Commonplace Book, read with an eye to the chronological order of the entries is to deepen the impression of the essentially humanistic character and attitude of Milton in all his periods. There is a breadth in his interests and a philosophic detachment in his point of view which lifts him well above his age. Practically all the great Renaissance subjects of speculation—all seemly and generous arts and sciences, except, indeed, the art of love—are represented in the titles under which he collected observations: man's moral nature, justice and the law, suicide, temperance, the poetic art, education, usury, patriotism, the state, the sovereign, the family, the principles of rule, nobility, sports and pastimes, military affairs and character; and the selection of materials is made in the spirit of a time when learning had not yet begun to degenerate into pedantry. Far less than one would expect, moreover, are the entries set down in the spirit of the seventeenth century controversialist. Those which concern the burning issues of the

time or have a bearing on Milton's special doctrines are intimately associated with those which do not. They are, like the rest, primarily materials for the formation or confirmation of opinion on the large principles in which they are involved. Thus the items on divorce grow out of the general consideration of marriage, and the exempla of revolution form a part of the study of the state and sovereign.

All this tells heavily against the conception of Milton, in the period of the prose works, as a rabid controversialist, swayed almost wholly by personal bias and party passion. Despite the opinion of Professor Raleigh that Milton's classification of his writings in the *Second Defense* (1652) was an afterthought, an attempt to make them seem in his own mind and that of others more objective and impersonal than they really were, I think it represents the substantial truth. He tells us that he wrote his pamphlets on divorce, education, and the freedom of the press as the result of a deliberate plan to further the cause of liberty according to a systematic classification of its parts. Everything that we know of him is in accord with the method and consideration implied in this statement, and the Commonplace Book, by showing his early concern with all these subjects, tends to corroborate it. Much has been said of the fierce personalities in which Milton allowed himself to indulge in his prose writings, and their tone has been taken as a trustworthy indication of the degree to which the iron of the struggle was entering his soul. But I am inclined to take him at his word when he disclaims love of contention (P. W., I, 142) and avows absence of personal anger (*ib.* 256), though I remember that he has in the *Christian Doctrine* described the sin of wrath as one to which even the saints are liable.

His own violence is that righteous indignation which is commanded by the word of God. A note in the *Commonplace Book* (176), later echoed in the *Apology for Smectymnuus* (1641/2), to the effect that Luther did not abstain in a righteous cause from using "words not civil at other times to be spoken," shows Milton justifying in his own mind the deliberate adoption of the worst controversial habits of the times, and doing so, moreover, before he had himself written anything to incur severe reprobation on this ground.

The discussion thus far has borne chiefly on the relations of the *Commonplace Book* to the Milton of scholarship and thought, and the illustrations of his application of the materials collected from his reading have been drawn primarily from the prose. I have, however, tried also to suggest that the process here represented was of a wider scope and advanced him steadily toward the ultimate goal of his life work. If a study of the *Commonplace Book* is illuminating in regard to the prose of Milton, it is still more so in its bearing on his poetry. The entries illustrate in a remarkable way the degree to which his studies, even in what might seem unprofitable fields, were made to contribute depth and richness to his mind, and, when thoroughly assimilated in his consciousness and touched with his emotion, furnished him with the materials of his poetic art. It is not to Andreini or Vondel that we must look for the sources of what is most characteristic and vital in *Paradise Lost*, but to the meditative reading of Milton in the records of human experience wherever they had been authentically set down—Scripture first, and then the classics, but also in the historians, philosophers, and poets of later times. To Milton almost no material was incapable of receiving the stamp of art. He has even embodied in a line from *Samson Agonistes* the

technical phrase which gives the title to Selden's learned volume:

Against the law of nature, law of nations.

We must not, of course, expect to find the passages referred to in the Commonplace Book appearing in recognizably explicit form in the poetry as they often do in the prose, though an exception is to be noted in the case of a citation from Ariosto, made in the Horton Period and used over twenty years later in a famous passage in *Paradise Lost*.¹⁶⁷ In general, the material has undergone such transformation that the parallels are indefinite and suggestive only. Yet it is not too much to say that almost the entire body of convictions and ideas implied or stated in the Commonplace Book underlies and even in one form or another finds a place in the poetical works. A few illustrations must here suffice.

Under the heading "De Curositae" on page 55, in the earliest stratum of Milton's Horton entries, occurs a note on the vanity of speculation about the unknowable: "Quaestiones profundas de deo quas humana ratio difficiliter interpretetur, aut, assequatur, aut non cogitandas, aut silentio premandas ne in vulgas edantur, deturque hinc materies schismatum in Ecclesia, sapientissime monet Constantius in epist: ad Alexandrum, et Arium. Euseb." etc. It is followed by a parallel observation, made after 1640, from Basil and by another from Sleidan. This is the position adopted by Raphael in his reply to Adam's

¹⁶⁷ "Eleemosynae post mortem datae in iis rebus perditis, et vanis numerat Ariostus quas ad circulum Lunae volare fingit sine ullo dantium fructu. l'elemosina è, dice, che si lassa alcun, che fatta sia dopo la morte. Cant. 34. Cf. *Paradise Lost*, III, 444 ff. Milton's "Not in the neighboring morn, as some have dreamed" is a specific allusion to Ariosto.

more abstruse inquiries (*Paradise Lost*, VII, 109 ff.).¹⁶⁸ The idea lies at the heart of Milton's whole intellectual attitude and the note in the Commonplace Book is the first explicit evidence of its formulation. Again in the Horton period and from the same set of authors the correlative idea (by no means contradictory in Milton's thought) of freedom of knowledge and inquiry is affirmed in a note citing authority for the use of profane authors by Christians (53). The specific argument here given is put into the mouth of Satan in *Paradise Regained*:

The Gentiles also know, and write, and teach. . . .
Without their learning how wilt thou with them,
Or they with thee hold conversation meet?
How wilt thou reason with them, how refute
Their Idolisms, Traditions, Paradoxes?
Error by his own arms is best evinc't.

Nor is its force altogether denied by Christ:

Think not but that I know these things, or think
I know them not.

The entry from Tertullian on Gluttony (13), with the suggestion that this was an aspect of the sin of Eve, and the citations on drunkenness (17) and lust, connect with *Comus*, with *Samson Agonistes* and especially with *Paradise Lost*, in the account of Eve's greedy ingorging of the apple and in the portrayal of the subsequent behavior of the pair. They exhibit as a first result of their sin something like the "dry intoxication of the mind" regarding which Milton quotes an observation of Thuanus (No. 52, p. 17). Similarly the notes on true nobility (191), including citation of the memorable utterances of Dante and

¹⁶⁸ The passage is more directly related to one in Lactantius, *Inst.* II, O, not quoted in the Commonplace Book. See Leach, *loc. cit.*, 307-8.

Chaucer, point to some of the literary sources of Milton's convictions on this topic, illustrating the lines from *Comus*,

Shepherd, I take thy word
And trust thy honest offer'd courtesy,
Which oft is sooner found in lowly sheds
With smoky rafters, than in tapestry halls
And courts of princes, where it first was named
And yet is most pretended.

and, more directly, those from *Samson*,

For him I reckon not in high estate
Whom long descent of birth
Or the sphere of fortune raises.

The effects of the early reflections of Milton on government and leadership are too pervasive in his later poetry to permit of full discussion here. A study of the *Commonplace Book* serves to throw into high relief the importance of these elements in the intellectual fabric of *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained*. Thus Milton's historical reading and his philosophical meditation on the part played by moral character in the conduct of public affairs underlies his treatment of the political career of Satan, and the fruits of his elaborate study of statecraft are to be seen throughout both poems, most clearly perhaps in the grasp with which in *Paradise Regained* he handles the military and political situation in the Roman world. Several times Milton has copied out from his authors striking statements of the true ideal of kingship, as a burden rather than a delight and an opportunity for service rather than for spoil. So on page 182: "officium et definitio imperatoris egregia est. Jus Graeco Romanum . . . ex lib. de jure qui est Basil. Constant. Leonis ubi ait τέλος τῷ βασιλεῖ τὸ ἐνεργεῖν, καὶ ἡνίκα τῆς ἐνεργεσίας ἐξατονήσῃ δοκεῖ κιβηλευεῖν τὸν βασιλικὸν χαρακτῆρα. vide etiam Orlando Inamora. del Berni cant. 7. stanz. 2 un re

se vuole il suo debito fare, non e re veramente ma fattore del popolo etc." And in the hand of the Christian Doctrine scribe on page 195: "Si in principatu politico aliqua est servitus, magis proprie servus est qui praeest, quam qui subest: August. de Civit. Dei. lib. 19 cap. 14." This theme is finely elaborated in Christ's rejection of the kingdoms of the earth in *Paradise Regained*. The first lines of my quotation are touched with Shakespearean recollections but the last three are manifestly a distillation of the sentences set down in the Commonplace Book:

What if with like aversion I reject
 Riches and realms; yet not for that a crown
 Golden in shew, is but a wreath of thorns,
 Brings dangers, troubles, cares and sleepless nights
 To him who wears the regal diadem,
 When on his shoulders each man's burden lies;
 For therein stands the office of a king,
 His honour, vertue, merit and chief praise,
 That for the public all this weight he bears.

In a passage which follows in the same speech Milton seems to be adapting and elaborating one of the scribal entries from Machiavelli's *Discorsi*: "Laudatissimos omnium inter mortales, eos esse quo vera Religione hominum mentes imbuunt, immo is etiam laudatiores qui humanis legibus Regna et Respub: quamvis egregie fundarunt." (197)

But to guide nations in the way of truth
 By saving doctrine, and from error lead
 To know, and knowing, worship God aright,
 Is yet more kingly: this attracts the soul
 Governs the inner man, the nobler part,
 That other o'er the body only reigns.

Words of Machiavelli in the mouth of Christ! Nothing could be more characteristic of the way in which Milton has laid under contributions in his poetry the wisdom of a

lifetime spent in the pursuit of truth, even to her strangest and most alien haunts.

As affording, therefore, an insight into the real and abiding intellectual temper of Milton and as a revelation of the preparatory intellectual processes which culminated in his greatest work, the *Commonplace Book* is an invaluable Miltonic document. It shows him in his quiet hours, philosophical and humane, though anything but indifferent, "turning over the whole book of knowledge," "reading all manner of tractates and hearing all manner of reasons," "scouting even into the regions of sin and falsity," but rejoicing in nothing so much as to find and record for memory and use, the examples of virtue and embodied truth. More, perhaps, than any of his formal writings, this accidentally preserved record of Milton's private studies serves to bridge the gap between his poetry and his prose and to show the essential oneness of his culture according to the best ideals of the Renaissance.

INDEX TO AUTHORS CITED IN MILTON'S COMMONPLACE BOOK ¹⁶⁵

(The numbers refer to the designated position of the individual works in the preceding list)

¹⁶⁶ The following entries in the *Commonplace Book* are set down without specific reference to the author from which they were derived: p. 12, Martino quarto. vide de bonis Eccles. (Villani?); p. 14, in fabulis nostris etc. (i. e. Geoffrey of Monmouth, II, 6, quoted from memory); p. 73, Anlafe's souldier etc. (Malmesbury, see No. 35, note 41a); p. 75, Read K. Xamute's act by the seaside (The anecdote is ascribed to Henry of Huntingdon in the *History of Britain*, but Milton is probably here citing it from one of the later chronicles); p. 109, Conjugal affection etc.; p. 110, Carolus Martellus etc., Ferdinandus etc. (These notes apparently go with the citations to Girard); p. 177, the form of a state etc.; p. 182, clergy commonly corrupters etc. (Holinshed?); p. 183, Parliament by three estates etc. (Girard?); p. 242,

- Ariosto, *Orlando*, 16
 Aristotle, *Ethics*, 40
 Ascam, *Toæophilus*, 47
 Augustine, *De Civitate*, 104
 Bacon, *Discourse*, 65
 Basil, *Homiliae*, 89
 Bede, *Historia*, 34
 Berni, *Orlando*, 81, 89
 Boccaccio, *Vita di Dante*, 15
 Boccacini, *Ragguagli*, 79
 Bodin, *De Republica*, 72
 Boiardo, *Orlando*, 100
 Buchanan, *Historia*, 59(?), 107
 Caesar, *Commentaries*, 74
 Camden, *Annales*, 44
 Campion, *History*, 63
 Cantacuzenus, *Historia*, 11
 Cedrenus, *Compendium*, 28
 Chaucer, *Canterbury Tales*, 67;
 Romaunt of the Rose, 68
 Chrysostom, *Homiliae*, 90
 Clement, *Paedagogus*, 18; *Stromata*, 17
 Codinus, *De Officiis*, 96
 Comines, *Memoires*, 54
 Costanzo, *Historia*, 109
 Curopalata (See Codinus)
 Cuspinianus, *De Caesaris*, 61
 Cyprian, *De Disciplina*, 19; *De Singularitate*, 56; *De Spectaculis*, 21; *Epistolae*, 20
 Dante, *Canzone*, 13; *Divina Comedia*, 12, 105
 Du Chesne, *Histoire*, 42
 Du Haillan, *Histoire*, 50, 53
 Du Thou (See Thuanus)
 Eusebius, *Historia*, 1; *Vita Constantini*, 2
 Evagrius, *Historia*, 7
 Frontinus, *Strategmata*, 97
 Gildas, *De Excidio*, 83
 Gilles, *Histoire*, 55
 Girard (See Du Haillan)
 Gower, *Confessio Amantis*, 69
 Gregoras Nicephoras, *Historia*, 10
 Gregory of Nyssa, *De Virginitate*, 92
 Guicciardini, *Historia*, 93
 Guillim, *A Display of Heraldry*, 86
 Hardyng, *Chronicle*, 58
 Hayward, *Edward VI*, 45
Historia Miscella (See Paulus Diaconus)
 Holinshed, *Chronicles*, 37
 Ignatius, *Epistolae*, 22
 Jovius, *Historia*, 48
Jus Graeco-Romanum (See Leunclavius)
 Justin Martyr, *Apologia*, 27; *Tryphon*, 26
 Justinian, *Institutiones*, 71
 Lactantius, *De Ira*, 30; *De Opificio*, 31; *Institutiones*, 32
 Lambard, *Archeion*, 41
 Leunclavius, *Jus Graeco-Romanum*, 75
 Machiavelli, *Art*, 43; *Discorsi*, 101, 102
 Martire (See Peter Martyr)
 Nicetas, *Historia*, 106.
 Paolo (See Sarpi)
 Paduanus (See Thomasinus)
 Paulus Diaconus, *Historia Miscella*, 4
 Peter Martyr, *In Librum Judicium*, 73
 Procopius, *De Bello Persico*, 5
 Prudentius, *Liber Peristephanon*, 14
 Purchas, *Pilgrimes*, 62
 Raleigh, *History*, 66
 Rivetus, *Commentarii*, 103; *Praelectiones*, 98
 Sarpi, *Istoria*, 49
 Savonarola, *Revelatione*, 33

- Schickhard, *Jus Regium*, 82
 Selden, *De Jure*, 70; *Uxor Hebraica*, 76
 Sesellius, *De Monarchia*, 60
 Sidney, *Arcadia*, 85
 Sigonius, *De Imperio*, 8, 108; *De Regno*, 9
 Sinibaldus, *Geneanthropeia*, 57
 Sleidanus, *De Statu Religionis*, 46
 Smith (Sir Thomas), *Commonwealth*, 39
 Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia*, 3, 91
 Sozomen, *Historia*, 29
 Speed, *History*, 38
 Spelman (?), *Concilia*, 84
 Spenser, *Ireland*, 64
 Stow, *Annales*, 36
 Sulpicius Severus, *Historia*, 6
 Tasso, *Gerusalemme*, 94
 Tassoni, *Pensieri*, 78
 Tertullian, *Apologetica*, 25; *De Jejuniis*, 24; *De Spectaculis*, 23
 Theodoritus, *Historia*, 88
 Thomasinus Paduanus, *Vita Petrarchi*, 80.
 Thuanus, *Historia*, 51, 52
 Villani, *Croniche*, 95
 Von Herberstein, *Commentarii*, 77
 Ward, *Animadversions*, 87
 William of Malmesbury, *De Gestis*, 35

JAMES HOLLY HANFORD.